QUOTES III

Quotations about

DIMENSIONS OF PERSONALITY


To differential psychologists, the question of 'What are the main human psychological differences?' provides the sport of kings. Suppose it be allowed that we all 'have' personalities that might be more or less directly 'measured'. The next interesting question will then concern which personality variations have actually turned out to be all quantifiable in practice. A great deal hangs on the answer. People probably differ from each other in most aspects of what it is like to be a person-except in capacities which have high biological survival-value. To detect and measure the main differences between people will thus mean we can begin to sketch the psychological structure of the human being which allows such surface differences in personality to occur. The master psychometrician-psychologists, Raymond Cattell and Hans Eysenck, both made their academic fortunes by arguing persuasively to their audiences that they had managed to 'carve nature at the joints'. [Cattell claimed to use superior statistical (factor-analytic) methods that were, in principle, more likely to align dimensions with the natural structure of personality-see Appendix to the Quotes; and Eysenck claimed (from experimental methods) to have begun to trace the underlying workings of the main psychological 'black boxes' and processes (of motivation and conditioning), the different functioning of which in different people yields our manifest diversity in behaviour and experience.]

The first extensive analysis of personality data was reported on 2,532 patients of general practitioners in Holland by Heymans and Wierink (1909, Zeitschrift für Psychologie 51). By the 1927, Cyril Burt felt able to claim (on a visit to Edinburgh, discussing work by colleagues in London—Henderson Trust Lectures, No. 7) that rating-scale data yielded two main temperament factors of neuroticism and extraversion (as they would be called today). (The term neuroticism is misleading in so far as neuroticism / emotionality is a perfectly attractive trait when coupled with good intelligence. - See Quotes XIV and XVII.) In the 1930's Woodworth's personality inventory (tapping n and e) was in use in the USA; and Thurstone and his wife developed additional measures of political and moral attitudes. By 1955, American psychometricians were searching for clusters of co-variation among self-report items and ratings that would allow talk of objectively identified 'dimensions of personality'. Especially to the forefront in this was the British-born Cattell, with his sixteen personality factors (and 16PF Test to measure them), plus another thirty or so ('Universal Index') factors found from time to time outside the questionnaire realm. There were, however, reliable correlations both among these sixteen 'oblique' and between them and others. This inter-correlation seemed to some (not to Cattell himself) to admit of their reduction to the equally reliably found six chief, independent, 'second-order' dimensions of personality. In the 1980's, data from Paul Costa and Jeff McCrae's Baltimore sample of adults (as part of US research into ageing) provided seemingly the best-ever data for dimension-hunters: data were amassed not only from hundreds of middle-aged testees but also from their spouses and from long-standing friends and neighbours on a good range of psychometric tests. Like Cattell and co-workers, McCrae and Costa came
to recognize six chief independent dimensions of psychological variation—a 'Big Five' that appear in questionnaires and ratings, plus Intelligence. Commonly used titles for the six dimensions, some possible Freudian parallels, and some suggestions as to how to envisage the alternative 'end' of each dimension) would be as follows.

Intelligence, general intelligence vs concretistic thinking;

Emotionality, neuroticism, anxiety, id? vs placidity, stability;

Extraversion, energy, surgency, eros? vs introversion, gravity;

Conscientiousness, control, superego vs impulsivity, casualness, liberality;

Disagreeableness, will, independence, ego? vs subduedness, passivity, affability;

Openness, Culture, affection, idealism vs tough-mindedness, cynicism, thanatos?

Three notes to this summary of the 'Big Six' are necessary.

(1) Many differential psychologists restrict the term 'personality' to non-intellective differences. This is principally because general intelligence (g) is best measured by 'puzzle' items to which the correct answer must be found. Hence there is often talk of the five-factor model of personality (FFM), or 'the Big Five'.

(2) By conventional standards, intelligence is easily and reliably measured. (For a discussion of the standards, see Quotes VIII.) However, it is hard to elicit valid self-ratings of intelligence. This is perhaps because most people mix largely with people of similar intelligence and education to themselves. Thus they find it hard to be realistic about their own levels of intelligence (see Brand, Deary & Egan, 1993, in G. Van Heck, Personality Psychology in Europe).

(3) McCrae and Costa's Disagreeableness seems to be similar to Cattell's Independence (or Promethean Will) vs Subduedness; but McCrae & Costa's Openness is probably a mixture of Cattell's Pathemia (Tender-mindedness) and Intelligence. (Openness correlates at around .35 with g even in studies where IQ range is restricted—see Brand, 1994, Europ. J. Personality.)

Why were the Big Five-or-Six (Big 5-or-6) the 'Six' including g—not recognized previously?

(1) Cattell's methods were sophisticated; but his writing involved many neologisms. (In fairness to Cattell, these were introduced so as to make clear distinctions between the concepts of factor-analytic psychology and those of ordinary language.) Thus many psychologists found Cattell's opus dauntingly hard to follow. At the same time, Cattell's readiness to incorporate strands of Freudian conceptualization into his analyses gained him few friends in the scientific psychology of his day.

(2) In Britain, Eysenck had championed a markedly smaller number of personality dimensions—urging in particular that only his Extraversion, Neuroticism and (after 1970) Psychoticism possessed much reliability or general significance or had firm, demonstrable bases in learning mechanisms and brain functions.

(3) In crude forms of measurement [asking whether people are 'quick', 'tough' 'strong' etc.], and also when subjects of lower levels of education are surveyed, some of the Big 5-or-6 show a tendency to fuse
to yield a reduced number of dimensions. In particular, extraversion sometimes correlates negatively with conscientiousness [as was long envisaged in Eysenck's theory of 'crime and personality']: the distinction between the normally independent dimensions of e and c fades to reveal a broad, crude dimension of ACTIVITY versus RESTRAINT. Likewise, will (Disagreeableness) and affection (Openness) sometimes fuse into a cruder contrast of POTENCY / TOUGHNESS versus GENTLENESS / SENSITIVITY. (See e.g. Brand, 1984, Psychology Survey 5; Shmelyov & Pokhil'ko, 1993, Europ.J.Personality 7; Brand, 1994, Psychologica Belgica.) [In the Eysenck Personality Profile, these two very broad dimensions are called EXTRAVERSION and TOUGH-MINDEDNESS respectively.] In addition, there is occasionally yet a third very broad factor of EVALUATION (e.g. Shmelyov & Pokhil'ko, op.cit.): this can involve a contrast of self-rated intelligence and rationality versus self-rated passion, emotionality, excitability, irritability, moodiness, unreliability, neuroticism and anxiety (e.g. Brand & Egan, 1989, Person. & Indiv. Diffs. 10). - Higher-neuroticism people tend to feel they lack competence, even though they do not generally lack competence and their feeling perhaps arises merely because of higher-n-scorers' greater emotional and behavioural variability and unpredictability. Shmelyov and Pokhil'ko (1993, op.cit.) distinguish "three realities" that are at work influencing the number of dimensions that will be recovered: (a) the objective structure of personality behaviour; (b) the recognition of these in any particular language as a socio-cultural phenomenon (modern Russian usage apparently involves six important independent personality dimensions accounting for perceived trait co-variation, and some nine accounting for lesser covariance); and (c) the affective representation system of individuals (involving, according to Shmelyov's work, Osgood's three dimensions of meaning). That as many as six dimensions (including g) are agreed today may well reflect the extensive use of highly educated testees instead of normal subjects: in McCrae and Costa's much-admired Baltimore sample, no fewer than a quarter of the subjects actually had Ph.D.'s.

(4) Whether more than the Big 5-or-6 dimensions are recovered probably depends somewhat on whether the set of tests that is factored involves items not only about 'fluid', mood-related aspects of ability and temperament, but also about the 'crystallization' of personality features into skills, habits, interests, values, sentiments and sensibilities. [The relation of 'fluid' personality to temperament (typical mood) is perhaps that high- and low-scorers on four of the personality dimensions tend to experience certain types of mood-state more commonly, along the following lines:

\[ e^+ \text{ vs } e^- = \text{elation vs depression, sadness, seriousness;} \]

\[ c^+ \text{ vs } c^- = \text{alertness vs fatigue, boredom, casualness;} \]

\[ w^+ \text{ vs } w^- = \text{confidence vs fear, submission, deference;} \]

\[ a^+ \text{ vs } a^- = \text{friendliness vs hostility, suspicion, cynicism.} \]

The domain of 'attitudes' -reflecting what people have come to believe- probably extends these 'fluid' personality features into a realm in which they interact with intelligence-see e.g. Quotes XXV.]

How should the Big 5-or-6 be understood in psychological terms? Sadly, despite many years of research-especially into extraversion-the picture is still very unclear (see e.g. A.Gale & M.W.Eysenck, 1992, Handbook of Individual Differences: Biological Perspectives; G.Matthews, 1993, in A.Smith &
D. Jones, *Factors Affecting Human Performance.* Here are some possibilities that still look viable yet falsifiable.

1. $g$ may be the efficiency with which even quite basic (perceptual) information is processed. (See Quotes IX.)

2. $n$ may be variability on any or all of the other dimensions of personality. Higher $n$ may be especially associated with long-term storage of personal memories-of events and episodes. (See Quotes XIV.)

3. $e$ sometimes seems to involve the ability to reduce levels of conscious arousal—whereas introverts become easily overloaded by noise, demands for speed, and the presence of others. ($e$ receives further consideration in Quotes XVI and XVII.)

4. $c$ may involve the ability to sustain arousal—allowing perseverance and preventing boredom, casualness, impulsiveness and negligence. (See Quotes XV, XVI and XVII.)

5. $w$ arguably involves the ability to attend narrowly, in a focussed manner, avoiding the influence of the perceptual field to some degree. - The related dimension of 'field-independence' was explored particularly in the work of Herman Witkin. (See Quotes XV, XVI and XVII.)

6. $a$, by contrast, would seem to involve the ability to process a rather wide range of abstract information with the help of imagination and high-level cultural symbols and ideas—or of what has lately been called an associational network of symbol manipulation. (See Quotes XVII.)

A further suggestion would be that each of the last four dimensions represents a degree of 'break-out' from two important 'trade-off functions' that are found widely in psychology. One is the SPEED versus ACCURACY trade-off, which, if uncorrected, makes for opposition between $e$ and $c$ (rather than for the independence that is more commonly observed). The second is the trade-off between NARROW versus BROAD attention: without correction by intelligence and learning, this trade-off would yield an opposition between $w$-like and $a$-like features, rather than the independence that is more commonly found in personality data.

As an overview of the Big 5-or-6 and their psychology, the suggestion would thus be that $g$ is a dimension of information-intake, that $n$ is a dimension of information-storage, and that the other four dimensions are all concerned with the modulation of levels of conscious arousal—with $e$ and $c$ making adjustments affecting behavioural output, and $w$ and $a$ modifying attention. (See Brand, Egan and Deary, 1995, in D.K. Detterman, *Current Controversies about Intelligence*, New Jersey, Ablex.) All these speculations are to a degree premature and problematic; but the 'converging consensus' of psychometricians will surely soon unleash more such efforts to complete the task of understanding dimensions psychologically upon which Eysenck first embarked in the 1950's with the variables of $E$ and $N$. (For further discussion of the psychology of the dimensions, see Brand, 1994, *Psychologica Belgica 34.* )

The problem

"We are still arguing whether extraversion or introversion are scientific entities, or simply artefacts; and whether it is legitimate even to look for any personality types at all."

http://www.cycad.com/cgi-bin/Brand/quotes/q03.html 9/13/2006
L.L. THURSTONE, 1934, *Psychological Review*.

"We need to develop a structural model-some kind of an overarching taxonomy-to link individual differences so that we're not all speaking idiosyncratic tongues."

L.R. GOLDBERG, 1981.

"As L.R. Goldberg has compellingly argued, a basic task of personality theory is to identify important dispositions for assessment and theoretical attention. With thousands of dispositional terms in the English language (and, presumably, constructs to parallel them), one clear function of personality theory is to establish guidelines of differentiated importance and priorities."

D.H. BUSS & K.H. CRAIK, 1984,

*Advances in Experimental Personality Research* 13.

"There is a rumour that psychiatry is based on scientific taxonomy, and that this is incorporated in DSM-3 (the American scheme of guidance for psychiatrists in diagnosing hundreds of supposedly different types of disorder). It is also rumoured that DSM-3 has succeeded in rescuing the fair damsel that is medical psychology from the dragon of statistical unreliability of diagnosis, and has led us to the promised land where all diagnosticians agree with each other. [The Selling of DSM-3 (by J.Best et al.)] shows clearly how little there is to substantiate these claims."


(i) Individual differences in personality: How are the main dimensions (or aspects, or components) to be discovered?

(See Appendix to *Personality, Biology and Society* for an introduction to factor analysis.)

"Those who regard factor analysis as the hobby of a special school, which the ordinary students, with no taste for numbers, can safely ignore, may be reminded that almost exactly the same procedure has found a reference in nearly every psychological textbook ever since textbooks began to incorporate experimental work. For the ordinary student of psychology, perhaps the simplest, earliest, and most familiar examples of this kind of analysis are:

(i) Wundt's attempt to determine 'the number of elementary feelings', and

(ii) the attempts of Helmholtz and other experimentalists to determine the number of elementary or 'primary' colours. Though the phrase was not explicitly used, the object of such efforts was to reduce the phenomena of feeling and of colour vision to terms of 'orthogonal factors'."


"Personality typologists use factor analysis in an attempt to form a periodic table of personality."
W.REVELLE, 1983.

"The second-stratum personality factors represent more inclusive constructs than do the first-level factors, and in some respects they are of greater importance [-e.g. possessing] higher predictive validities than narrower dimensions."

M.LORR & Judith A. DeLONG, 1984,

Journal of Clinical Psychology 40.

"I do not believe that analysis of a correlation matrix, by whatever method, can deepen our understanding."


"The archaeologist does not dig with a bulldozer, but with infinite patience and time. The gem splitter thinks three months not excessive for a major diamond stone cut. But slick and false methods are considered good enough by most for finding personality factor structure."


"...norm-referenced psychometrics spawned many concepts and data analysis techniques whose use has spread well beyond psychology and education - one thinks of factor analysis for a start. On the other hand, it has rightly come in for a good deal of criticism over the years: whether as a polarising instance of correlational psychology (Cronbach, 1957, 1975), as "the use of a modern technology to prop up outdated social arrangements" (Butcher, 1968), as irrelevant to the learning behaviour the teacher can influence (Ainslow & Tweddle, 1979; Wheldall & Merrett, 1984) or as an operational approach that inhibited interest in the cognitive processes constitutive of intelligent action (Tomlinson, 1981)."


(ii) One major dimension of human difference?

(See also: Quotes XI, 'The importance of intelligence';
Quotes XXIV, 'Group differences: r/K theory'.)

"Many theorists have held that there are two fundamental modes of awareness, of knowing, or of viewing the world; and that the variation [in human experience] can be largely understood in terms of one basic dimension or polarity. Carl Jung contended that the dimension of introversion vs extraversion is so basic to our experience that even the major disputes in Western philosophy since the time of Plato and Aristotle are expressions of this contrast. William James' characterization of the basic split in philosophy in terms of tender-minded and tough-minded types is closer to the mark.... On the basis of
my own research on patterns of theoretical orientation in psychology, I have concluded that there is a general dimension which I have called *fluid vs restrictive* orientation that runs through psychology, philosophy, and a variety of other disciplines. In all likelihood, it is the dimension that most basically separates people drawn to the arts and humanities from people drawn to the natural sciences on the basis of their preferred modes of experience... In the questionnaire realm, the fluid-restrictive dichotomy is represented by a general factor of *subjectivism vs objectivism...* Correlations with available measures of Jungian types indicate that objectivists tend to emphasize the THINKING and SENSATION functions, while subjectivists emphasize FEELING and INTUITION... Many differences in experience that have been characterized in terms of masculine and feminine modes apply here. There is Jung's distinction between the *logos* and *eros* principles. In Chinese thought, the parallel distinction is between *yang* and *yin*. Roger Sperry's research with "split-brain" patients has inspired a fresh spate of related speculation regarding a contrast between "left-hemisphere" and "right-hemisphere" modes of consciousness. The former is said to be linear and analytical, while the latter is holistic and intuitive."


New York : Greenwood Press.

"For each of...sixteen trait terms [e.g. dominant, gregarious, agreeable, humble] subjects gave "maximal" self-ratings [e.g. 'How dominant could you *ever* manage to be?']. A factor analysis of the intercorrelations did not yield the circumplex structure found with standard trait ratings ['How dominant are you?']. Rather, the *maximal* traits showed no negative intercorrelations, instead forming a positive manifold."


"...g[eneral intelligence] frankly has bigger and better correlates than any other putative dimension in the whole of psychology. It correlates positively with all mental abilities, with life-time achievements, and with moral qualities and attitudes: so it is no surprise that reference to 'intelligence' is not a caprice of psychometricians. All told, g is to psychology what carbon is to chemistry."


"The evidence presented here...joins the extensive data set already assembled indicating that a single pervasive dimension—K—underlies a variegated complex of human life-history characteristics resulting from a trade-off between egg production and other adaptive behavior such as parental care and social organization (Rushworth, 1985, *Person. & Indiv. Diffs*.). Essentially, genotypes reproducitively compete *either* by allocating energy to sexual behaviour directly and increasing the number of offspring produced, or by diverting energy to traits which enhance social organization, thereby increasing the number of offspring maturing to adulthood. Freud (1930, *Civilization and its Discontents*) also predicted a positive correlation between restrained sexuality and the production of culture, based on the psychodynamics of repression and sublimation. The *r/K* perspective (i.e. *r*-through-to-*K* perspective, which contrasts species along the above lines, e.g. oysters-*through-to-* elephants) predicts the relationship in terms of correlated traits."

http://www.cycad.com/cgi-bin/Brand/quotes/q03.html

9/13/2006
"...K.J. Schneider (1990, The Paradoxical Self) suggests 'a more useful distinction than the neurosis/psychosis distinction by describing the modes of hyperconstriction and hyperexpansion as illustrative of the continuity and structure of dysfunctional action.... Under the hyperconstrictive, Schneider includes the depressive psychosis, the obsessive compulsive, the overly dependent, anxiety disorders, phobias and paranoia, and anorexia nervosa. Hyperexpansion includes those who are manic, narcissistic, psychopathic, greedy, histrionic, antisocial and impulsive. Mixed (i.e. bimodal) dysfunctions describe the schizophrenic and the schizoid, the borderline, bulimic and passively-aggressive. ...The Paradoxical Self represents fascinating reading for those who have longed for one book to integrate a multiplicity of theories and ideas within the framework of a single principle. The paradoxical principle.... "holds that the psyche is a constrictive/expansive continuum.".... Under the hyperconstrictive, Schneider includes depressive psychosis, the obsessive compulsive, the overly dependent, anxiety disorders, phobias and paranoia, and anorexia nervosa. Hyperexpansion includes those who are manic, narcissistic, psychopathic, greedy, histrionic, antisocial and impulsive."

Alyce OOSTERHUIS, 1993, Theory & Psychology 3."

"

"...[today] we accept, indeed regard as a platitude, an idea that Aristotle rejected, that someone can have one virtue while lacking others. For Aristotle, as for Socrates, practical reason required the dispositions of action and feeling to be harmonized; if any disposition was properly to count as a virtue, it had to be part of a rational structure that included all the virtues. This is quite different from our assumption [in the modern world] that these kinds of virtuous disposition are enough like other psychological characteristics to explain how one person can, so to speak, do better in one area than another.... [today] we do not believe in the unity of the virtues."

Bernard WILLIAMS, 1985, Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.

London : Fontana.

(iii) Two dimensions of personality?

(a) re Eysenck's classical position, stressing:

Extraversion versus Introversion

(cf. Sanguine + choleric vs phlegmatic + melancholic)

AND

Neuroticism/Emotionality.

(cf. Melancholic + choleric vs phlegmatic + sanguine)
"The traditional classification of temperaments, and it is still pretty well as good as any other, is into the sanguine, the melancholic, the phlegmatic and the choleric. The sanguine is fickle, changeable, mercurial. The phlegmatic is difficult to move, unenthusiastic, takes things as they come, is placid and solid. The melancholic is emotional enough, but of a sentimental poetic mood, inclined to mysticism, and to depression. The choleric is single of purpose, headstrong, bigoted, the stuff that reformers and die-hards are both made of. Micawber was sanguine, Columbus was choleric, Don Quixote melancholic; but no great or interesting person was ever phlegmatic. At most he put on the appearance of it."

Godfrey H. THOMSON, 1924, *Instinct, Intelligence and Character.*


"In one of his very earliest papers (Eysenck, 1940) we see perhaps the first sign of what was to become a besetting habit of thought for Eysenck - the tendency to describe almost anything in terms of two dimensions. In this paper...we find Eysenck explaining the appreciation of poetry in terms of two dimensions of *extraversion* and *neuroticism.*"

J.RAY, 1986, in S. & Celia Modgil,


"The evidence suggests that Type A behaviour (i.e. irritable and bombastic behaviour, sometimes held to be especially associated with proneness to coronary heart disease) is simply a combination of *extraversion* and *neuroticism,* has no unitary significance, and, because of the strong genetic determination of both *extraversion* and *neuroticism*...is also strongly determined by genetic factors."


"A People Catalyst (Choleric type *(neurotic extravert)* [according to the Galen/Wundt/Eysenck framework]) thrives on involvement with those around him, and sees service to mankind as a life goal.

A Hard Charger (Melancholic *(neurotic introvert)*)) is the executive who believes in tradition, follows rules, and sees a prescribed way of doing things.

The Fast Track (Sanguine *(stable extravert)*) executive sees risk in terms of challenge. He can turn on to special projects at the exclusion of all else. He is particularly good at pulling things and people together.

The Power Broker (Phlegmatic *(stable introvert)*)) is innovative and resourceful, and is especially good at motivating others."

J.LEIGH, 1985, 'Executives and the personality factor'. *Sky 4, v.*

(b) Other 2-D schemes

1) For Freud's *eros* and *thanatos,* see Quotes XVIII.

2) For dimensions of social attitudes, e.g. *conservatism* vs *liberalism* and *tough-* vs *tender-mindedness,* see below, and also Quotes XXV.
3) Another popular 2-dimensional scheme, c. 1970:

"Several workers have demonstrated that interpersonal behaviour can be meaningfully described by a circular structure, a circumplex, which expresses the relationship between different personality styles around two orthogonal axes. The two main axes are more commonly identified in terms of a dimension of dominance versus submission and an affiliative dimension of hostile versus affectional behaviours."

R. BLACKBURN (a British clinical psychology researcher), 1983.

"[The 'interpersonal circle' involves] a two-dimensional Euclidean space reflecting the joint action of two basic interpersonal dimensions or motivations, almost universally designated Control (or Dominance) and Affiliation.


4) A two-dimensional scheme envisaging bases for personality dimensions in subject-typical mood-states and emotions:

"The Emotional Profile Index] measures eight basic emotions as described by R. Plutchik (1980, Emotions: a Psychoevolutionary Synthesis). It assumes that all personality traits result from the mixture of two or more primary emotions.... [The dimensions of emotion] are: joy, acceptance, surprise, fear, sadness, disgust, expectation and anger. [They inter-correlate and can be] arranged as a [two-dimensional] circumplex in terms of similarities and bipolarities [which circumplex in turn yields the Personality Profile Index].... In the final version of the P.P.I. there are 89 items (trait terms) to which subjects respond on a 5-point scale of 'never' to 'very often'. The dimensions of the circumplex are:

acceptance, submission, passivity, assertion, sociability, rejection, aggression, and suppression."


London: Routledge.

5) Data from the beginning of modern empirical work on personality.

"....we reanalyse the data that Heymans and Wiersma collected on pupils from secondary schools about 80 years ago.... the data are best described by a two-dimensional structure.... The eigenvalues of the first five factors are 8.5, 6.6, 3.6, 2.8 and 2.0 respectively.... Factor A describes characteristics of the more promising pupil, with terms such as clever and learning by heart at the positive pole and absent-minded at the negative pole.... Factor B describes characteristics of the attentive and polite, as opposed to the restless and interfering pupil."

M. DODDEMA-WINSEMIUS & B. DE RAAD, 1993,

European Journal of Personality 7.

(iv) About four dimensions?
re Eysenck post-c.1970', adding:

Psychoticism / Tough- vs Tender-mindedness / Cynicism vs Openness;

and / or

'Lie' Scale / Conservatism vs Liberalism / Conscientiousness.

"H. Sjöbring (1973, Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavia) postulated four basic personality dimensions which he named (rather oddly):

VALIDITY (energy, self-confidence vs caution, weakness);

SOLIDITY (steady, dependable, rigid vs changeable, impulsive);

STABILITY (coolness, sophistication vs warm, sociable, naive); and

CAPACITY (a measure of intelligence)."

A.L. JOHNSON et al., 1975,


"A. Tellegen (1985)....presented a three-factor model that is quite similar to Eysenck's [E, N and P] except that the E factor is called Positive Emotionality, the N factor is labelled Negative Emotionality, and the P factor [reversed] is described as Constraint."

M. ZUCKERMAN et al., 1988,

Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 54.

"[H.J. & M.W. Eysenck's new book] makes the case that their four-and-a-half dimensions of personality - general intelligence (g), neuroticism (N), extraversion (E), psychoticism (P) and the "half" for lying (L) - account for a surprisingly high percentage of empirically registered variation in human behaviour and self-reported experience; and that these dimensions have demonstrable biological bases in genetic variations, in physiological manifestations (for example, in blood group), and in experimentally distinguishable psychological mechanisms - although Michael Eysenck sounds many cautionary notes about the latter possibility."


"The results of our phenotypic factor analysis [on 7,620 Australian adults] are consistent with Eysenck's view that Extraversion, Neuroticism and Social Desirability ('Lie')...are unitary traits. [And in our] 4-factor solution, the fourth factor could clearly be identified with Eysenck's concept of Psychoticism...."


"....the intercorrelations and results from the factor analysis [on 59 male students at Düsseldorf University] broadly confirm the convergence of the Eysenckian dimensions Extraversion and Neuroticism [with] Pavlovian nervous system properties. The role of Mobility [which correlated
around .60 with Extraversion and Sensation Seeking] certainly has to be considered more extensively in future investigations and theoretical considerations. Anxiety and Neuroticism were clearly negatively correlated to all three Strelau Temperament Inventory scales [i.e. Strength of Excitation, Strength of Inhibition, and Mobility], with strongest associations [around -.55] with Strength of Excitation."

Irene DAUM et al., 1988, European Journal of Personality 2.

"[Factor analysis on 439 students] revealed a clear three-factor structure of anxiety, superego and exvia which was replicable across sexes.... It is contended that superego, rather than psychoticism, may best lay claim to join neuroticism and extraversion in what may be termed the great triumvirate of the personality sphere."


"[In my study of 410 students, using Cattell's 16PF] the identification of extraversion, anxiety/neuroticism and 'socialisation' super-factors is in good agreement with evidence reviewed by Mackenzie (1988, Person. & Indiv. Diff.s).... There is a superficial resemblance to the Eysenck E, N and P factors."


"[In our study of self-ratings by 160 young adults of above-average education,] Varimax rotation....yielded possible equivalents of Eysenck's Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism as the three chief factors beyond which factor definition was markedly less feasible. [Twelve scree-tested components were rotated.]

[Our] Psychoticism dimension, when reversed, might be a superego factor, or one of convergent vs divergent ('creative') thinking.

SCRUPULOSITY versus SPONTANEITY might serve as a title.

[Our Extraversion dimension] contrasts an expressive, engaging and dynamic style with one of greater restraint, placidity and tolerance.

SURGENCY versus STOICISM might provide a title.

[Our Neuroticism versus ego defence dimension] contrasts emotionality, passion and excitability with composure, deliberation and unsentimentality."


"In the field of personality four questionnaire factors stand out: extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism and obsessional traits.

of Individual Differences: Biological Perspectives.

Chichester : Wiley DePublisher.

"{In c.1500 socially representative Dutch adults} it is possible to measure three (almost) orthogonal and-with respect to both external (sex, age and intelligence) and internal parameters-highly invariant factors of personality.... The three dimensions are denoted S, E (Extraversion-Introversion) and N (Neuroticism). In view of the contents of the S-scale {e.g. 'arrogant', 'haughty', 'deceive others', 'selfish'}, the term 'Insensitivity' was chosen for S {intended to index Schizoidia}. This factor took the place of Eysenck's EPQ-P factor, which proved {translated into Dutch} to be less invariant (or even highly unstable) and only obliquely related to the intended construct to be measured, the schizoid personality."


"Subjects were 624 six-to-seven-year-old children, from Shanghai and the north-western region of the US.... Our findings indicated considerable similarity of factor structure in the two cultures, obtaining three factors labelled Surgency, Negative Affect and Attentional Self-Regulation (or Effortful Control). Differences across cultures were also found, with Surgency and Effortful Control scores being relatively higher than Negative Affect in the US sample...."


"[G.L.Mangan's The Biology of Human Conduct] is concerned with the laboratory investigation of Extraversion (alias strength, or non-reactivity, of the nervous system), Neuroticism (alias dynamism), and similar putative dimensions of personality such as mobility, lability and irradiation of inhibition.... Although the Russians have lately relaxed Stalin's ban on IQ-testing, Soviet typological theory of personality seems to be in a Lysenkoist mess. The fact is that the firmly materialistic and 'biological' work that Mangan reports has been tolerated over the years only on the understanding that it has nothing to do with important psychological differences between people - which differences are considered [by USSR officialdom] to be matters of nurture rather than of nature."


"[The Eysencks'] whole idea of calling [their] Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism "superfactors" is an upside-down trick of adopting the vision of a hierarchy. Actually....these "supers" have less effect on any actual behavior items than do lower-order factors. They would be presented to the clinicians and others less misleadingly as "remote influence" factors, useful in depth psychometry."


"Poland has historically been a link between Russia and the West; and in the study of personality too, the work of the Warsaw School, led by Jan Strelau [on reactivity, activity, strength of excitation, strength of inhibition and mobility], has acted as such an intermediary.... Having tried to keep up with the theory, and relate it to my own, I have finally given up the uneven struggle. I do not believe that the Russian work has given rise to a theory the elements of which are sufficiently agreed among proponents to make reasonable deductions possible, and the various concepts are not defined by identical measures from one investigator to another."

**Other roughly 4-dimensional biologically based schemes:**

"Paul Gilbert suggests that evolution has given rise to a varied set of social competencies which form the basis of our personal knowledge and understanding. These competencies are: a) Care eliciting b) Care giving c)Co-operating d)Competing. Each of these are seen as core schemata, or archetypal potentials around which knowledge is built...."


"C.R.Cloninger (e.g. 1987, *Archives of General Psychiatry*) has suggested a classification of human personality based on three dimensions, each of which appears to be normally distributed in human populations:

"harm avoidance" (*vs* risk taking);

"novelty seeking" (*vs* stereotypy);

"reward dependence" (*vs* social independence, or task persistence).

Although they are defined in terms of observed personality assessments, the three dimensions can be linked to distinct neurotransmitter systems (based, respectively on

serotonin

dopamine

and norepinephrin)."


"The number of fundamental dimensions (scales) of temperament and their meaning correspond to the four-stage structure of the functional system:

afferent synthesis - to ergonicity;

programming (decision-making) - to plasticity;

execution - to individual tempo;

feedback to the acceptor of the results of action - to emotional sensitivity."

V.M.RUSAlov (Institute of Psychology, Moscow), 1989,

*Personality & Individual Differences 10.*
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"[Our three factors from an Icelandic translation of the Basic Personality Inventory] bear strong resemblance to the 'big three' factors (e.g., Eysenck's PEN) that have emerged repeatedly over the years in analysis of self-reported personality trait scales."

T. BJORGVINSSON & A.P.THOMPSON, 1994,

*Personality & Individual Differences* 16.

(v) The 'Big Five-or-Six' dimensions?

- cf. McCrae & Costa, and Brand & Egan, now adding in:

*Independence vs Subduedness / Disagreeability vs Agreeability*

and perhaps

*General Intelligence.*

"Sixty adjectives that are in common use for describing people....were given to each of 1300 raters....five factors were sufficient to account for the coefficients."


"My own acceptance of the five-factor model came reluctantly during the course of a meta-analysis of several studies (Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981), which included the early work of Cattell (1947), Fiske (1949), Tuples and Christal (1961), Norman (1963), and one of my own studies.... My lovely, interesting, and complex hierarchical model did not replicate well, whereas the five-factor model did. As I bade my beautiful but irresponsible model farewell, I had the same feeling I experienced when I sold my Austin-Healy and began driving a Subaru."


"[Our results from 17,381 normal American adults] confirm what has been found in most previous studies of [Cattell's] 16PF second-order structure. The "big five" -

*Extraversion,*

*Anxiety,*

*Tough Poise (vs Tender-mindedness)*

*Independence (vs Subduedness / Agreeability) and*

*Control (cf. Superego) -*

are clearly identifiable in the present data."


"Deeper causal analyses [than ours] may seek to account for the structure of personality; but the
structure that must be explained is, for now, best represented by the five-factor model [Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness and Agreeableness]."


"If a large number of rating scales is used, and if the scope of the scales is very broad, the domain of personality descriptors is almost completely accounted for by five robust factors."


"Over the last forty years, many researchers have provided evidence of the existence of five robust factors of personality, at least when ratings by others are used (7 refs.). Although Norman (1963) described the five factors as

Surgency,

Agreeableness,

Conscientiousness,

Emotional Stability and

Culture,

Digman and Inouye (1986) (see above) have recently labelled them as:

Introversion-Extraversion,

Friendly Compliance vs Hostile Noncompliance,

Will (to Achieve),

Neuroticism or Anxiety, and

Openness to Experience.

Our factor-analytic results [on 669 normal Australian adults]...give strong indications of at least five factors shared by the three inventories [of Cattell, Eysenck and Comrey]."


"...Lorr et al. (1985, J. Clin. Psychol.) discovered that five dimensions were common to the Interpersonal Style Inventory and [Cattell's] Sixteen Personality Factors. These factors were:

Self-Control, Extraversion, Autonomy,
Emotional Stability vs Anxiety, and Level of Socialization."


"There are important advantages to discovering a comprehensive dimensional structure of personality.... A strong consensus appears to be forming on precisely such a structure. Different investigations, most based on trait rating data, have been converging on a five-factor model of personality structure (Fiske, 1949; Tupes & Christal, 1961; Norman, 1963; Digman & Takemoto-Choek, 1981; Goldberg, 1981, 1982; Hogan, 1983, McCrae & Costa, 1985, 1987; Digman & Inouye, 1986). Although there is some disagreement about labels and precise meanings, these five factors have been named:

Surgency [seeming to the authors to involve extraversion and dominance versus introversion and submission]

Agreeableness [agreeable, warm versus cold, quarrelsome]

Conscientiousness [will to achieve: conscientious, responsible]

Emotional Stability [secure, emotionally stable]

Openness [Intellectance, Culture: cultured, intelligent versus uncultured, stupid]."

M.BOTWIN & D.BUSS, 1987, 'The structure of act report data'.

Dept Psychology; Univ. Michigan; Ann Arbor.

"Hogan (1982, in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation) examined extant empirical classifications [of personality traits], noted what he regarded as strong similarities, and proposed these six categories:

intellectance, adjustment, surgency, likeability, sociability and conformity.

Goldberg's five unnamed categories strongly resemble Hogan's."

A.H.BUSS & S.E.FINN, 1987,

Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 52.

"Longitudinal research, such as Conley's (e.g. 1985, J. Person. & Soc. Psychol.) analyses based on the Kelly Longitudinal Study, demonstrate that dimensions closely resembling the Big Five, when rated by spouse and self some 45 years earlier, show remarkable stability over time and predict important life outcomes, such as alcoholism, emotional disorders, life satisfaction and divorce."

O.P.JOHN, A.ANGLEITNER & F.OSTENDORF, 1988,

European Journal of Personality 2.
"There are over 115 chemical elements, and more are still being discovered. What makes us think that we could do with five? There are 100,000-1,000,000 genes. What makes us think that only five of them are personality-relevant? The only sensible argument is: parsimony. A lot of nature can be caught with a few elements, like oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen and carbon. Personality factors likewise obey the law of diminishing returns.... The prehistory of personality psychology can be described in terms of divergent production. Each self-respecting theorist has his or her favourite typology or set of dimensions. Apparently the discipline - if that is the word - attracts poetic minds. The joint result has been chaos, engaging and charming though it may have been. The five-factor taxonomy has put an end to that prehistoric phase.... However, the remaining indeterminacies in the number and rotational positions of the dimensions constitute a permanent seduction for those who want more. The foremost source of inspiration seems to be Factor V (Openness / Imagination / Intellectance / affection / Tender-mindedness).

W.B.HOFSTEE, 1994, 'Are we looking for parsimony, or what?'

European Journal of Personality 8.

"The clearest discrepancies across findings from various taxonomies concern Factor V.... In contrast to the replicated American-German version [viz. Intellect / Imagination].... studies of Dutch personality language have resulted in [a Factor V] defined by adjectives such as critical, sharp and militant (e.g. De Raad, 1992, Eur.J.Person.6).... we believe - and this is in agreement with De Raad - that different Factor V versions come about because of differences in the definition of personality used to select trait terms.... the Dutch, Italian and Hungarian teams used more 'permeable sieves' to select representative sets of personality descriptors from their languages. Hence they used a broader definition of personality than that of the category of Dispositions in the German taxonomy. For example, in the Italian taxonomy, adjectives were selected mainly according to a single utility criterion according to which a group of judges were introduced to answer two questions simultaneously: Does the adjective fit into the sentence 'X is an [adjective] person'? and How useful is this adjective for describing personality? (Caprara & Perugini, 1994, Eur.J.Person.8).

F.OSTENDORF & A.ANGLEITNER, 1994,

European Journal of Personality 8.

"[Openness] is a trait dimension that affects nearly every aspect of the individual's life, from political attitudes (Riemann et al., 1993, PAID; Trappnell, 1994, Europ.J.Person.) to musical preferences (Dollinger, 1993, Psychology of Music 21). Openness is seen as much in affective and sensory systems (McCrae, 1993-4, Imagination, Cognition & Personality 13) as in cognitive systems. It is thus not surprising that sexuality - so central a part of the human experience - is pervasively influenced by Openness: open men and women have more information about sex, wider sexual experience, stronger sexual drives, and more liberal sexual attitudes. When [Hermann] Hesse depicts Goldmund's absorption in erotic experience he illustrates an important manifestation of Openness."

R.R.McCRAE, 1994, 'Openness to Experience.'

European Journal of Personality 8.
"We are not surprised that R.R. McCrae and P.T. Costa (1985, *J. Personality*) were able to recover a five-factor solution from their data, for only items that were considered *a priori* to be representative of the five-factor model were included in the final analysis.... Looked at in this new light, the evidence for the five-factor model is not as convincing as was suggested in the comment by McCrae and Costa (1986, *Amer. Psychologist*).... we believe that the field of clinical psychology, as well as personality, should refrain from jumping on to a "big five" bandwagon."


"The "Big Five" solution... has E and N very prominently, together with the factor labelled "agreeableness" which is very much the opposite of P, and correlated negatively with it. Thus it has essentially the same three components, together with what is essentially a cognitive or intelligence factor, and what seems to be a lower-order factor called "Conscientiousness", which may or may not be a minor part of Psychoticism (genative)."


"...what first attracts our attention is the consistent relationship (median .40 in 5 large samples) between Extraversion and Openness... as well as the negative relation (around -.40) between Neuroticism and Conscientiousness... ...if Openness could be seen as a - very important - facet of Extraversion, and Conscientiousness as an important component of the positive pole of Neuroticism; and if, conversely, as is well known, Agreeableness is a good marker of Psychoticism [5 refs], is the ghost of the P-E-N system not reappearing here...?"


"...of the 188 scales (researched by McCrae & Costa in relation to their own Big Five) only 13 per cent had their highest correlation with NEO Openness (as compared to 29 per cent for Neuroticism, and some of these correlations with Openness are quite low in absolute size.... McCrae's....argument that Openness is a broader construct than Intellect or Imagination seems implausible to me. In any case, I find his recurring references to various characters in works of literature completely irrelevant to the issue....

Over the years, I have struggled to understand [Brand's] writings, with no great success.... The two of us seem to think on different wavelengths. Brand often sends me to the unabridged dictionary... this type of exposition is not my favorite style of scientific reporting."


"Tuples and Christal (1961, U.S.A.F. Technical Report) re-analyzed correlation matrices from eight different samples, ranging from airmen with no more than high-school education to first-year graduate students who were rated either by peers, supervisors, teachers or experienced clinicians in settings as diverse as military training courses and a sorority house. In all the analyses, Tuples and Christal found 'five relatively strong and recurrent factors and nothing more of any consequence'. They labelled their factors:
I Surgency (talkative, assertive, energetic);

II Agreeableness (good-natured, co-operative, trustful);

III Dependability (conscientious, responsible, orderly);

IV Emotional Stability (calm, not neurotic, not easily upset); and

V Culture (intellectual/cultured, polished, independent-minded)....

More recently, Peabody and Goldberg (1987, report from Oregon Research Institute) performed a comprehensive series of structural analyses and argued that one can think of the five factors as related to

I POWER

II LOVE

III WORK

IV AFFECT and

V INTELLECT, respectively....

[Our own] factor analysis of the intercorrelations among the 96 clusters [formed by 1,203 Dutch adjectives] yielded seven factors, five of which corresponded to the Big Five. The two additional factors were labelled Aggression (Irritation) and Conservatism.

O.P.JOHN, A.ANGLEITNER & F.OSTENDORF, 1988, 'The lexical approach to personality: a historical review of trait taxonomic research'.

European Journal of Personality 2.

"Three....studies of the High School Personality Questionnaire have been undertaken at the Faculty of Education and Design at Brunel University in which a factor analysis of the items has yielded six factors including 'intelligence'. These were Ormerod and Billing (1982), Caroll (1982), [and] Waller (1987)."


"A visual scree test suggested a maximum of five factors [in this factor analysis of eight personality inventories, completed by 312 students]....

Factor 1 is the Activity factor [loaded for Energy and Extraversion].

Factor 2 is the Neuroticism-Anxiety factor....

Factor 3 is the Sociability factor [loaded for Affiliation and Adaptability versus Detachment].

Factor 4 [may be called] Impulsive / Unsocialized / Sensation-Seeking [loaded for Monotony Avoidance versus Cognitive Structure].
Factor 5 is the Aggressive / Sensation-Seeking factor [loaded for Aggression and Hostility vs Responsibility]."

M. ZUCKERMAN et al., 1988,

Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 54.

"The six [Promax factors] for the [379] adults [who took a 105-item version of Cattell's 16PF Test in the course of a survey in Virginia into cardiovascular risk factors] are:

Extraversion [e.g. 'talk too much', 'enjoy inviting guests' vs shyness];

Neuroticism [e.g. 'bothered by others' opinions', 'sometimes feel like crying', prefer dancing to wrestling, 'highly strung', 'have strong emotional moods'];

Psychoticism [e.g. 'unco-operative', 'impatient', 'always speak my mind', 'like to have things my way', inconsiderate, 'not annoyed by off-colour jokes / tardiness']; (=? Independence)

Conservatism [e.g. prefer bowls to chess, jokes to politics, attending class to reading, Columbus to Shakespeare, prose to poetry, practical to contemplative friends];

(=? Tough-mindedness)

IQ [e.g. continuing a number series];

and

Superego Strength [e.g. 'interested in hearing details of accidents', 'think planning ahead is worth it', 'bothered by hearing things against my own beliefs', 'use spare time to do odd jobs (vs chatting)'].
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Similar to previous investigators, we found no evidence for a factor structure similar to Cattell's (primaries).... Our six factors for the adults are quite similar to six of the seven found by Kline and Barrett (1983, *Advances in Behav. Res. & Therapy* 5). They are more stable than Cattell's primary traits, and do not have such high inter-factor stability coefficients."


"Different investigations, most based on trait rating data, have been converging on a five-factor model of personality structure (10 refs). Although there is some disagreement about labels and precise meanings, these five factors have been named:

_ Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness (Will to Achieve),_

_ Emotional Stability and Culture (Intellectance / Openness)._"

M.D.BOTWIN & D.M.BUSS, 1988,

*Journal of Personality & Social Psychology.*

"There is even some evidence that the five-factor model may apply in non-American and even non-English-speaking populations (M.H.Bond et al., *J. Cross-Cultural Psychol.* 6."

Patricia NOLLER, H.LAW & A.L.COMREY, 1988,

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 53.

"The self-ratings [of 200 Dutch students on 747 adjectives] were analysed by means of Principal Components. According to the scree test (R.B.Cattell, 1966, *Multivariate Behvrl Res.*) the first six factors deserved further consideration.... a face-value comparison indicated that the first six factors in particular, namely

_ Coldheartedness, Extraversion, Emotional Instability,_

_ Conscientiousness, Culture and Agreeableness_ were fairly well comparable to the usual adjectival dimensions."  


"The Adjective Check List was used to study the cross-measure validity of the five-factor model of personality.... Results of the factorial A.C.L. adjective scales from 143 respondents failed to confirm the structure of the five-factor model.... After a careful review of the results of the various factor extraction methods, number of factors extracted, and rotation procedures, the authors chose the six-factor solution yielded by the principal component analysis as being the most appropriate for the purposes of the present study."
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H. LIVNER & Cheryl LIVNEH, 1989,

*Personality & Individual Differences 10.*

"[In our study] it appears that the medium of a brief, adjectival, ipsative checklist (e.g. 'Are you best described as 'cheerful', 'determined' or 'forgiving'?') involving previously quite untried items, yields as its first six Varimax factors [out of 47] the 'Big Five' dimensions that can be identified in others self-report studies, together with a factor that arguably reflects differences in self-assessed fluid intelligence. Provisional summary titles for the six factors might be:

---

energy / extraversion, conscientiousness / control,

will / independence, affection / tender-mindedness,

neuroticism / rhathymia and general (fluid) intelligence."


"The Big Five factors were found [in a study of some 400 West German adults] to be robust across self- and peer-rating data, different selections of trait adjectives, and variations in factor-analytic methods as well as rating formats... It is concluded that the Big Five represent universal dimensions of personality language, at least in the domain of trait-descriptive adjectives." Alois ANGLEITNER & Fritz OSTENDORF, 1989, to the First European Congress of Psychology, Amsterdam.

"In the past, it was one purpose of [questionnaire] studies to identify the factor structure of personality. There is now consensus, however, that a five-factor model is highly replicable in various respects [e.g. as in Robert McCrae's work]."


"Personality traits have been recently conceptualized in terms of the so-called Big Five (Digman, 1990, *Ann.Rev.Psychol. 41*):

I Extraversion - Introversion;

II Friendliness - Hostility;

III Conscientiousness (will to achieve);

IV Neuroticism / Emotional Stability;

V Intellect

According to John, Angleitner and Ostendorf(1988, *Eur.J.Person.*), these five dimensions are often
related at the broadest level to

Power

Love

Work

Affect

and Intellect;

and although these dimensions should not be considered final, they form 'a heuristically useful framework'.

[In a study of 26-year-old males in Finland, one could conclude that men with the antisocial life-style tended to differ from men with the socially adaptable life-style in all of the Big Five factors."


"Personality factors showed coherent links with tactics [in romance], including

Surgency (Coercion, Responsibility Invocation),

Desurgency (Debasement),

Agreeableness (Pleasure Induction),

Disagreeableness (Coercion),

Conscientiousness (Reason),

Emotional Instability (Regression), and

Intellect-Openness (Reason)." D.BUSS, 1992, 'Manipulation in close relationships: five personality factors in interactional context.' *Journal of Personality* 60.

"Most structural investigations of the five-factor model have employed *single adjectives* as stimuli (e.g. Brand & Egan, 1989), or *scales from personality inventories* (e.g. Conn & Ramanaiah, 1990). Recently, however, [Ostendorf et al.] investigated the structure of *questionnaire items* taken from four widely used instruments.... Factor analysis of the 576 items from these inventories revealed the expected five-factor structure...."

J.S.WIGGINS & A.L.PINCUS, 1992, 'Personality: structure and

assessment'. *Annual Review of Psychology* 43.

"...researchers have found that not more than five factors generalize across subjects, across observers, across variables, across factor-analytic algorithms, and across languages."
P. BORKENAU, 1992, 'Implicit personality theory and the five-factor model.' *Journal of Personality 60.*

"[From correlations between 1650 trait terms, as used by hundreds of 'judges' of Russian usage (many of them professional psychologists) in our Russian personality-trait taxonomy project,... the six most important factors [principal components were:]

*Altruism:* good\bad, kind\evil

*Intellect:* clever\stupid

*Energy/Gaiety:* active\passive, light-hearted\sad

*Conscientiousness:* orderly\absent-minded

*Toughness:* strong\weak, brave\cowardly

*Emotional stability:* reserved\irritable."

Alexander G. SHMELYOV & Vladimir I. POKHIL'KO, 1993,

'A taxonomy-oriented study of Russian personality-trait names'.

*European Journal of Personality 7.*

"The present study investigated the comprehensiveness of the Five-Factor Model for description of personality [in c. 1300 normal young adults, including 266 public vehicle driving license applicants].... Factor analyses of the data showed that a sixth factor, consisting primarily of psychopathological variables [cf. Eysenck's Psychoticism] was needed to account for the variance."


"A final analysis is reported (on English....) pupils mainly of a wide ability range and with an average age of 14+, comprising 1083 cases in all, to whom Cattell's High School Personality Questionnaire was applied. Factor analysis of their responses (to 140 items) yielded five orthogonal factors plus intelligence, in order of extraction:

independence vs agreeableness

tender-minded vs tough-minded

stable vs neurotic

conscientious vs lax"
extraversion vs introversion.

.... it would appear that these results support the contention that the 'big six' dimensions of personality exist in the adolescent age range 14-16 years, since they can be equated with Brand et al.'s (1993, 'Personality and general intelligence', in G. Van Heck et al., Personality Psychology in Europe 4) summaries as follows:

'Independence' seems to equate with their description of 'will'(w);

'Tender-mindedness' " " " " " affection' (a);

'Neurotic' " " " " " neuroticism' (n);

'Conscientious' also definitely corresponds to 'conscientiousness' (c);

'Extraversion' corresponds with the dimension of 'energy' (e).

The summary of the 'big six' is completed by 'general intelligence' (g).... Thus this final analysis extends and clarifies the findings first reported by Ormerod and Billing (1982, Person. & Indiv. Diffs.3) and confirms the existence of the six factor model of personality in a large sample of wide ability in the adolescent age range.

M.B.ORMEROD, J. McKENZIE & A.WOODS, 1995, 'Final report on research relating to the concept of five separate dimensions of personality - or six, including intelligence.' Personality & Individual Differences 18, 4, 451-461.

"Because of the impressive replicability of the Five-Factor Model (FFM) in adult personality psychology, developmental psychologists have recently begun a search for the antecedents of these five adult dimensions in childhood. ....Parents of children.... were asked simply 'to describe your child'. The audio-taped interviews were transcribed literally and then coded. (For 229 9-year-olds from Holland, Belgium and Greece, the median percentages of the descriptors falling within the categories used (including their opposites), was:

Extraversion (sociable, dominant, active) 25%

Agreeableness (helpful, manageable, honest) 19%

Intellect/Culture/Openness 13%

Emotional Stability (controlled, confident, ~anxious) 10%

Conscientiousness (careful, dependable, diligent) 11%

School Performance 4%
Family Relationships 4%

Independence 4%

Ambiguous phrases 4%)


"Our data (from 477 Italian adults) map ten....aggression indicators into the personality space defined by the Five-Factor Model of personality. The quadrant containing most of these variables is defined by Emotional Instability (the negative pole of Emotional Stability) and Hostility (the negative pole of Friendliness)....Irritability has the highest correlation with Emotional Stability

\[(r = -0.61)\], and a moderate one with Friendliness (-0.32). Anger is expressed most strongly as the second highest correlation, after Irritability, with Emotional Stability (-0.58), but weakly with Friendliness (-0.19).... Hostile Rumination has the highest correlation of any of the scales with Friendliness (-0.42), but also a moderate one with Emotional Stability (-0.29)."


"....at least six factors are needed to account for behavior consistencies at the highest level of the personality hierarchy."


"It is precisely the entire absence of....a nomological network of constructs from concepts such as 'agreeableness' and 'conscientiousness' that has caused me to criticize their postulation as two of the major dimensions of personality (Eysenck, 1992, Person. & Indiv. Diffs. 13). Agreeableness and conscientiousness are simply descriptive terms of certain elementary types of behaviour; the descriptions do not follow from any more inclusive theory, and they carry no deductive implications other than those implicitly in their designation-i.e. that people having high scores should prove to be agreeable or conscientious. The only link with behaviour somewhat different from that contained in the terms themselves would be with synonymous or semantically related behaviour. [By contrast] extraversion is causally linked with low cortical arousal, and there are literally hundreds of deductions which follow from that theory, creating a huge nomological network, many of whose predictions have been tested successfully (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, Personality and Individual Differences: A Natural Science Approach). The same applies to neuroticism."


(vi) Schemes requiring further dimensions.

"Six values are assessed [by Gordon Allport's Study of Values]:

http://www.cycad.com/cgi-bin/Brand/quotes/q03.html

9/13/2006
(1) Theoretical (concern with the discovery of truth)

(2) Aesthetic (concern with form and harmony (and with art and beauty in general))

(3) Economic (concern with what is useful)

(4) Social (concern with altruistic love (and humanitarian goals))

(5) Political (concern with power)

(6) Religious (concern with unity).

These values were originally based on Spranger's (1928) six-fold typology of ideal values, and also seem to bear some resemblance to J.L. Holland's (1973, *Making Vocational Choices*) six interest types."


Monterey, California: Wadsworth (Brooks/Cole).

"In the field of personality four questionnaire factors stand out: extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism and obsessional traits.


Chichester: Wiley DePublisher.

"A...weakness often noted in psychiatric nosology is the reliability of diagnoses: different psychiatrists very frequently apply different diagnostic labels to a given patient. It is frequently claimed that the arrival of DSM-III, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Diseases, published by the American Psychiatric Association, has overcome this difficulty, and that all is now plain sailing. [Kirk & Kutchins (1992, *The Selling of DSM*) have] shown clearly that these claims, often made by official sources, are quite unjustified; *paturient montes nascetur ridiculus mus*! (The mountains will be in labour, to produce a ridiculous little mouse! HORACE.)"


(vii) Schemes requiring multiple, 'oblique' (i.e. correlated) factors?

"How many dimensions of personality might there be: as few as three or as many as fifty? If personality is more complex than "intelligence" (and in truth includes intelligence) and if there are at least twenty-three factors of the latter (Ekstrom et al., 1976), perhaps there are more than fifty to be found?"

E. HOWARTH, 1987, 'Beyond general factors of personality'.
"Ray Cattell's work on personality has an acknowledged place in history, and his studies were amongst the first to use factor analysis creatively in this field. However, what was new and exciting over forty years ago no longer stands up to psychological and psychometric requirements. [In modern research] the usual finding is that there are some six factors, quite unlike the Cattell factors, and that there is really no evidence for Cattell's original conception."

London : Johnson House, NW10 7QE.

(viii) Are 'dimensions of personality' really 'retrieved from human nature' by empirical endeavour? - Or are they best thought of as being 'imposed upon it'?

"Our common stock of words embodies all the distinctions men have found worth drawing, and the connexions they have found worth marking, in the lifetimes of many generations: these surely are likely to be more numerous, more sound, since they have stood up to the long test of the survival of the fittest, and more subtle, at least in all ordinary and reasonably practical matters, than any you or I are likely to think up in our armchairs of an afternoon - the most favoured alternative method.... ordinary language is not the last word: in principle it can everywhere be supplemented and improved upon and superseded. Only remember, it is the first word."

J.L.AUSTIN, 1961, Philosophical Papers.

"By linking his descriptive dimensions to psycho-physiological substrates, Eysenck has created a compelling causal theory, a claim few others in personality can make."

D.M.BUSS, 1982, Contemporary Psychology.

"Language could not be invented or come upon if its archetypes were not already present in the human mind. For man to understand but a single word truly....all language, in all its connections, must already lie prepared within him."


"One may see 'mental testing' as an orthodoxy which has inherited both the great strengths and the
relative weaknesses of the men who founded it. Many were men of outstanding statistical gifts; but the majority were not equally interested in the observation of individual human beings.... They have administered 'batteries' of tests to their 'subjects'....viewing personal contact as a source less of insight than of 'bias'. They seem happiest when people are at a safe distance."


"The fact that the known species in either zoology or botany numbers in the millions serves to shame the pretences of any behavioral typologist who seeks to employ at most a dozen 'species' of personality organization to account for human behavioral diversity." W.G.DAHLSTROM, 1972, 'Personality systematics and the problem of types'.

"....there is no justification at all for the psychometrician's claims to have established the scientific measurement of individual differences."

B.EVANS & B.WAITE, 1981. *The Intelligence Controversy?*

--------------------------------------------

**Osgood's 'dimensions of meaning'** (reliably found in studies of people's ratings of both the physical and social worlds):

"....all three of the major factor analyses [for Osgood's *The Measurement of Meaning*, 1957] yielded nearly identical evidence for three massive factors, easily identifiable as:

*Evaluation* (good, nice, beautiful, honest, etc.);

*Potency* (strong, big, thick, tough, etc.); and

*Activity* (active, quick, excitable, hot)....

But *why* such massive *E*, *P* and *A*-and so little of anything else?....

We really are-Chomsky and the rationalists to the contrary-a kind of animal; and what is important to us now about the signs of things, as it was in the days of Neanderthal man, are:

*E* (Do they signify things good or bad for me?),

*P* (Are the things signified strong or weak with respect to me?), and

*A* (Do they refer to things that are active or passive-things that I must fight or flee, or things I can simply avoid or ignore?).

These "gut" reactions to the signs of things are crucial to individual survival."

"Careful scrutiny of both Eysenck's and Cattell's personality theories reveals that they are both founded, in effect, on implicit personality theory and not on purely objective observations. Eysenck chose to investigate extraversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability as a result of his extensive reading, both ancient and modern, of people's beliefs about personality. Cattell began his investigations by reducing the 18,000 trait words [of Roget's Thesaurus] to a more manageable 35 scales covering distinct aspects of personality. Both investigators' initial studies, which formed the basis of all their subsequent work, involved having people rate other people on personality scales, and were therefore as much studies of the observers' beliefs about personality as they were studies of the personalities of those being observed."

Sarah E. HAMPSON, 1982, in D. Davey & Marjorie Harris,  

"...every marriage is two different marriages - the husband's and the wife's."

A.D.M. DAVIES, 1982, reviewing *Past and Present in Middle Life.*

"...much of the results [concerning perceived differences in national character] can be summarized by the three dimensions of Tight-Loose [cf. Introversion-Extraversion (or Activity)], Assertive-Unassertive (or Potency), and general evaluation."


"We must read the Bible or we shall not understand psychology. Our psychology, our whole lives, our language and imagery are built upon the Bible."

Edward F. EDINGER, 1986, *The Bible and the Psyche: Individuation*  

"There is no agreed-upon reality when we consider human experience."


"Social constructionism has amplified the earlier ideas of Mead (1934), arguing that selves, persons, psychological traits and so forth, including the very idea of individual psychological traits, are social and historical constructions, not naturally occurring objects."

E.E. SAMPSON, 1989, in J. Shottter & K. Gergen,  

"The academic debate [about the nature of homosexuality] has centred round two camps: the "essentialists" (who stress the relative degree of continuity between different variants of the "same" sexuality [e.g. in ancient Greece and modern Britain]); and the "constructivists" (chiefly of the 'social'
variety) who point to the age, cultural and historical specificity of the content of even the same-named identity (if it exists)... The constructivists seem to be winning."


"Philosophers...have not found it easy to translate precisely into English terms like [the Hindi terms] dharma and nirvana."  

"What we take to be the dimensions of self in the present era may be viewed, in part, as the accumulated armamentarium of centuries of debate."

K.J. GERGEN, 1989, in K.J. Gergen & J. Shotter,  

"Neutrinos exist. Leprechauns do not. But what about attitudes?... The lack of predictive success in the social sciences seriously undercuts the analogy between neutrinos and attitudes."


"It is my view...that reports of the death of personality theory are premature, that it is too important an area to be left entirely to personality theorists, and most importantly that intelligence itself consists partly of what must be called intellectual personality traits."

J. BARON, 1982, in R.J. Sternberg,  
*A Handbook of Human Intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.

"Attribution theory is not a theory but an expression of a general intellectual movement in the direction of pragmatic relativism."


"...the dimensions of variation that are at first discovered in people's ratings of each other might be held to reflect nothing but the workings of the eye of the beholder, and to be dimensions of mere subjective meaning.... But the co-variation of ratings that yields such dimensions is greater when the ratings are of real, known people than when raters are asked to give their ideas as to which characteristics tend to go together in general, in virtual strangers...."

[In any case, an interesting yet non-intuitive] accord becomes visible between the dimensions that emerge in the systematic study of how English personality descriptors work and the broad, 'objective' dimensions that have repeatedly appeared, under various guises, to [academic] students of personality.... two of these [six dimensions] are evaluative while being at the same time fully descriptive (g[eneral intelligence] and neuroticism). The other four are quite distinguishable (versions) of Osgood's two very
broad descriptive dimensions of Potency (will vs affection) and Activity (energy vs conscience).


Leicester: British Psychological Society.

"I think that it can be argued that American-oriented personality research has reached the essential position advocated by Eysenck in the 1950's: namely, that there are a small number of personality traits that influence behaviour in diverse social settings, and these traits are influenced by genotypes."


"Theorists such as Schweder (1980, J. Personality) have suggested that the personality structures seen in self-reports and in ratings reflect cognitive schemata rather than true relations among traits.... In response to these criticisms, naturalistic and laboratory studies have demonstrated that trait attributions are indeed based on observable behavior (Gormly & Edelberg, 1974, Amer. Psychologist; Small et al., 1983, J. Personality) and that the structure of traits found in implicit personality theory accurately reflects covariation among observed behaviors (Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1987, J. Personality)."

R.R. McCRAE & P.T. COSTA, Jr, 1989, 'The structure of interpersonal

traits'. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 56.

"Critics of personality research have asserted that consistency of personality is in the eye of the beholder and does not reflect differences between rated targets.... [In our study] three members of the same family, both parents and an adolescent, supplied self-ratings as well as ratings of the two other members.... The correlation between ratings of the same target by different perceivers [around r = .45] was compared with that between ratings of different targets by the same perceiver [r = .25].... the present study illustrates that lay people....tend to agree about the perceived characteristics of well-known targets, provided they can use the tools developed by professional psychologists instead of their own conceptual framework."


"I [hypothesize] that personality traits such as surgency, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are the most important psychological dimensions of our social adaptive landscape. They provide information for answering adaptively important life questions:

Who is high or low in the social hierarchy?

Who is likely to rise in the future?

Who will make a good member of my coalition?

Who possesses the resources that I need?

Who will share their resources with me?

With whom should I share my resources?
Who can I go to for advice?

Whom can I depend on when in need?

With whom should I mate?

Who will be a good co-operator and reciprocator?

Who might do me harm?

Whom can I trust?

I hypothesize that people have evolved psychological mechanisms sensitive to individual differences in others that are relevant to answering these critical questions."


"The old criticism (Mischel, 1968; Schweder, 1975) that traits are merely convenient fictions in the minds of raters, with no bearing on real social behaviour, can be laid to rest (e.g. Funder, 1983, J. Personality)."


"Each of 22 subjects evaluated 14 repertory stimulus persons by means of 140 unipolar personality adjective scales. As a result, we found three robust inter-individual factors that were interpreted rather closely to Osgood's Evaluation, Potency [and] Activity factors of affective meaning (Osgood, 1962, Amer. Psychol.; Osgood et al. 1975, Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning, U. Illinois Press), namely Moral, Pragmatic [and] Energetic evaluations (cf. Shmelyov, 1982, Vestnik-Moskovskogo-Universiteta-Seriy-14-Psihologiya 2). From a psychosemantic point of view, the 'meaning system' of the personality lexicon is exposed to the influences of at least three realities at the same time: the objective structure of personality, the implicit personality theory as a socio-cultural phenomenon, and the affective representation system. The proportions of these influences can be dependent not only on experimental tasks (external versus internal ratings), but also on the cognitive style of subjects."

Alexander G. SHMELYOV & Vladimir I. POKHIL'KO, 1993,

'A taxonomy-oriented study of Russian personality-trait names'.

European Journal of Personality 7.

"How can men "figure out" which women possess the highest fertility or reproductive value?... our ancestral humans did have access to three classes of cue that provide probabilistic evidence of a woman's age and health status:

(a) features of physical appearance (e.g. full lips, clear skin, smooth skin, clear eyes, lustrous hair, symmetry, good muscle tone, and absence of lesions);

(b) observable behavior (e.g. sprightly, youthful gait, and high activity level); and
(c) social reputation (e.g. knowledge gleaned from others about a person's age and prior health history).....

Men who fail to prefer qualities that signal high reproductive capacity would, on average, leave fewer offspring...."


Epilogue

"The history of the psychology of personality, from Hippocrates onwards, is littered with the fragments of shattered typologies."

Paul KLINE, 1975.

"During a visit to Europe after World War II, [the factor-analytic psychologist,] Cattell met [the German giant of psychiatric diagnosis,] Kretschmer, and told him of his factor work - in particular that he had found a leading factor [invariably emerging as the largest of Cattell's 'primary', oblique personality factors] which he had named cyclothymia- schizothymia, [using Kretschmer's terminology]. On hearing this, Kretschmer remarked, "Ach, Herr Cattell, now I believe in factor analysis."


"In a curious way, trait theory has been ignored by personality theorists who emphasize either conscious influences on behaviour, or unconscious influences. Such theorists as A.Bandura (1986, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*) and G.A.Kelly (1955, *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*) would agree, for somewhat different reasons, that one cannot understand personality without understanding the thoughts and beliefs of an individual. Dynamic theorists and Freudians would find trait theorists' emphasis on behaviour acts a superficial analysis of personality. They would insist that the true reasons for human actions are to be found in unconscious influences."

Nathan BRODY, 1988, *Personality: In Search of Individuality*.


"There is a strong tradition in psychology to eschew categorical in favor of dimensional thinking, a tradition in psychometrics that runs unbroken from Spearman to Eysenck. [However] if 1,000 people at random are put to work selling used cars or commanding military units, psychoanalyzing or behavior modifying, doing research or teaching sixth grade civics, we would find a J-curve and, quite possibly, a bimodal distribution of competence: just a few good sales people (some better than others), just a few charismatic leaders, a few born teachers, and a handful of truly effective therapists. Even compared with other scientists, some 5% publish 50% of the papers (D.J.Price, 1962, in B.Barber & W.Hirsch, *The Sociology of Science. New York : Free Press*)." D.T.LYKKEN et al., 1992, *American Psychologist* xii.
"After decades of doubt and defensiveness, traits are back on top."


"Still something is lacking. A human personality is more than personality characteristics, and thoughts, or life-styles. Gordon Allport said that personality 'is what lies behind specific acts and within the individual'. Therefore, we need other concepts and means of study to disclose changes in the concealed side of personality."

Lea PULKKINEN, 1992,

European Journal of Personality 6, 2.

FINIS

[Compiled by Chris Brand, Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh]