Unit 10: Personality

Essential Task 10-5: Describe the trait theory of personality with specific attention to the Big Five traits of openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism.
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Schools

- The *psychoanalytic perspective* – emphasizes the importance of unconscious processes and the influence of early childhood experiences

- The *humanistic perspective* – emphasizing the self and the fulfillment of a person’s unique potential

- The *trait perspective* – emphasizes the description and measurement of specific personality differences among individuals

- The *social cognitive perspective* – emphasizing learning and conscious cognitive processes,
The Trait Perspective: Not Why but What

An individual’s unique makeup of durable dispositions and consistent ways of behaving (traits) constitutes his or her personality.

Examples of Traits

- Honest
- Dependable
- Moody
- Impulsive
Allport

• “Are you that little boy.” Freud
• Goal was to define personality in terms of identifiable behavior patterns
• Description and classification
• Allport & Odbert (1936), identified 18,000 words representing traits.
• Cut this down to 200 – still too much
Trait Perspective

• **Trait** is a characteristic pattern (identifiable) of behavior or a disposition to feel & act, as assessed by self-report inventories & peer reports.

• Emphasis on **describing & classify** noteworthy traits
Allport’s Traits

• **Cardinal Trait** – Defining characteristic, in a small number of us, that dominates and shapes all of our behavior

• **Central Trait** – general characteristic; between 5 and 10 of these shape much of our behavior

• **Secondary Trait** – a characteristic apparent in only certain situations
Exploring Traits

Factor analysis is a statistical approach used to describe and relate personality traits.

Cattell used this approach to develop a Factor 16PF inventory (Personality factors questionnaire).

Raymond Cattell (1905-1998)
Factor Analysis

Cattell found that large groups of traits could be reduced down to 16 core personality traits based on statistical correlations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>low score</th>
<th>high score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>cold, selfish</td>
<td>supportive, comforting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>instinctive, unstable</td>
<td>cerebral, analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>irritable, moody</td>
<td>level headed, calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>modest, docile</td>
<td>controlling, tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveliness</td>
<td>somber, restrained</td>
<td>wild, fun loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>untraditional, rebellious</td>
<td>conforming, traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assertiveness</td>
<td>shy, withdrawn</td>
<td>uninhibited, bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>coarse, tough</td>
<td>touchy, soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoia</td>
<td>trusting, easy going</td>
<td>wary, suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractness</td>
<td>practical, regular</td>
<td>strange, imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>open, friendly</td>
<td>private, quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>confident, self assured</td>
<td>fearful, self-doubting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openmindedness</td>
<td>closeminded, set-in-ways</td>
<td>curious, exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>outgoing, social</td>
<td>loner, craves solitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>disorganized, messy</td>
<td>orderly, thorough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>relaxed, cool</td>
<td>stressed, unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trait Perspective

- **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)**
- Attempts to sort people according to Carl Jung’s personality types.
- 8 possible traits, with two opposing traits
- Dominant 4 traits can create one of 16 distinctive personality types
- Based on a 126 questionnaire
- Used to help individuals find a suitable career
Myers & Briggs

• Introversion (I) vs Extraversion (E)
  – (I) getting my energy from within oneself; described as “reserved” and “reflective”
  – (E) getting my energy from active involvement in social interactions; described as “outgoing” and “sociable”
Hans and Sybil Eysenck used factor analysis and suggested that personality could be reduced down to three polar dimensions, 1. extraversion-introversion; 2. Neuroticism (emotional stability-instability), and 3. psychoticism (hostile or friendly you are with others).
Eysenck
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INTROVERTED
Passive
Careful
Thoughtful
Peaceful
Controlled
Reliable
Even-tempered
Calm

EXTROVERTED
Active
Optimistic
Impulsive
Changeable
Excitable
Aggressive
Restless
Touchy

STABLE
Calm
Reliable
Even-tempered
Controlled
Peaceful
Thoughtful
Careful
Passive

UNSTABLE
Calm
Reliable
Even-tempered
Controlled
Peaceful
Thoughtful
Careful
Passive

Moody
Anxious
Rigid
Sober
Pessimistic
Reserved
Unsociable
Quiet
Eysenck

Factor Analysis
Assessing Traits

**Personality inventories** are questionnaires (often with true-false or agree-disagree items) designed to gauge a wide range of feelings and behaviors assessing several traits at once.
The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is the most widely researched and clinically used of all personality tests. It was originally developed to identify emotional disorders.

Assesses normal Personality Tendencies vs. Traits

True-false self report questionnaire that describe wide range of normal and abnormal behaviors
MMPI Test Profile

- Hypochondriasis (concern with body symptoms)
- Depression (pessimism, hopelessness)
- Hysteria (uses symptoms to solve problems)
- Psychopathic deviancy (disregard for social standards)
- Masculinity/femininity (interests like those of other sex)
- Paranoia (delusions, suspiciousness)
- Psychasthenia (anxious, guilt feelings)
- Schizophrenia (withdrawn, bizarre thoughts)
- Hypomania (overactive, excited, impulsive)
- Social introversion (shy, inhibited)

T-score

After treatment
(no scores in the clinically significant range)

Before treatment
(anxious, depressed, and displaying deviant behaviors)

Clinically significant range
Today’s trait researchers believe that Eysencks’ personality dimensions are too narrow and Cattell’s 16PF too large. So, a middle range (five factors) of traits does a better job of assessment.

- Openness/Culture
- Conscientiousness
- Extroversion/Introversion
- Agreeableness
- Neuroticism/ Emotional Stability
# The “Big Five” Personality Factors

*(Memory tip: Picturing a CANOE will help you recall these.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Dimension</th>
<th>Endpoints of the Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
<td>Disorganized ↔ Careful ↔ Disciplined ↔ Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td>Ruthless ↔ Soft-hearted ↔ Trusting ↔ Helpful ↔ Suspicious ↔ Uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td>Anxious ↔ Calm ↔ Secure ↔ Self-satisfied ↔ Insecure ↔ Self-pitying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(emotional stability vs. instability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td>praktical ↔ Imaginative ↔ Preference for variety ↔ Independent ↔ Preference for routine ↔ Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion</strong></td>
<td>Retiring ↔ Sociable ↔ Fun-loving ↔ Affectionate ↔ Sober ↔ Reserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from McCrae & Costa (1986, p. 1002).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about the Big Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How stable are these traits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How heritable are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How about other cultures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can they predict other personal attributes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating the Trait Perspective

The Person-Situation Controversy

Walter Mischel (1968, 1984, 2004) points out that traits may be enduring, but the resulting behavior in various situations is different. Therefore, traits are not good predictors of behavior.
The Person-Situation Controversy

Trait theorists argue that behaviors from a situation may be different, but average behavior remains the same. Therefore, traits matter.

![Graph showing trait score correlations over seven years for different age groups: Children, Collegians, 30-year-olds, and 50- to 70-year-olds. The correlations range from 0.1 to 0.8.](image-url)
Trait Perspective

• Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)
• Attempts to sort people according to Carl Jung’s personality types.
• 8 possible traits, with two opposing traits
• Dominant 4 traits can create one of 16 distinctive personality types
• Based on a 126 questionnaire
• Used to help individuals find a career that is suitable for their
Myers & Briggs

• Introversion (I) vs Extraversion (E)
  – (I) getting my energy from within oneself; described as “reserved” and “reflective”
  – (E) getting my energy from active involvement in social interactions; described as “outgoing” and “sociable”
• Sensing (S) vs Intuition (N)
  – (S) Paying attention to physical reality, what I see, hear, touch, taste, and smell. I'm concerned with what is actual, present, current, and real.
  – (N) Paying the most attention to impressions or the meaning and patterns of the information.
Myers & Briggs

• Thinking (T) Feeling (F)
  – (T) make a decision, I like to find the basic truth, logic or principle to be applied, regardless of the specific situation involved.
  – (F) make the best decisions by weighing what people care about and the points-of-view of persons involved in a situation
• **Judging (J) & Perceiving (P)**

  – (J) prefer a planned or orderly way of life, like to have things settled and organized, feel more comfortable when decisions are made, and like to bring life under control as much as possible.

  – (P) prefer a flexible and spontaneous way of life, and I like to understand and adapt to the world rather than organize it.
“An animal resting or passing by leaves crushed grass, footprints, and perhaps droppings, but a human occupying a room for one night prints his character, his biography, his recent history, and sometimes his future plans and hopes. I further believe that personality seeps into walls and is slowly released. . . . As I sat in this unmade room, Lonesome Harry began to take shape and dimension. I could feel that recently departed guest in the bits and pieces of himself he had left behind.” —John Steinbeck, *Travels With Charlie*
Personal living space (PLS)

- a concept intended to designate a class of residential environments that holds increasing importance within contemporary urban life (S. D. Gosling, Craik, Martin, & Pryor, in press).

- Much more than a bedroom but less than a full-fledged house, a PLS is typically a room nestling within a larger residential setting while affording primary territory for a designated individual.
Mechanisms linking individuals to the environments

• Identity claims
  – Are symbolic statements made by occupants to reinforce their self-views.
  – Cultural symbol (poster of MLK)
  – Personally symbolic (pebble from their favorite beach)
    Observer can still see that they are sentimental.
  – These can be for themselves or to let others know what they are like or would like to be like

• Behavioral residue
  – the physical traces of activities conducted in the environment (scattered charcoal from drawing) or traces of behavior conducted outside the environment (a snowboard propped up against the wall).
Momentary Impressions

- In a meta-analysis of nine of these so-called “zero-acquaintance” studies, the consensus correlations among observers averaged .12 (ranging from .03 to .27) across the Five-Factor Model (FFM) personality dimensions.

- Observer consensus is not equally strong for all traits judged by far, the strongest consensus was obtained for Extraversion, with Conscientiousness a distant second, and the least consensus found for Agreeableness.
Hypothesis

- Physical spaces hold more cues to an occupant’s level of organization (e.g., from alphabetized books and compact discs), tidiness (e.g., a neat vs. messy space), values (e.g., a poster supporting the legalization of marijuana), and recreational pursuits (e.g., tickets to the opera).

- The availability of such cues should promote relatively strong consensus for observers’ judgments of Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience.
Process

- Observers should notice the Residue or Evidence
- Then observers should infer the behaviors that created the physical evidence
- Finally observers should infer the traits that underlie the behaviors
Accuracy Criteria

• To derive a criterion measure against which the accuracy of the observer reports could be gauged, we obtained self-ratings from occupants and peer ratings from the occupants’ close acquaintances. We obtained accuracy estimates by correlating the observers’ ratings with the combined self- and peer ratings.

• Averaged across the five dimensions examined in this study, the self ratings correlated .40 with the peer ratings; this value is comparable to that reported in previous research (e.g., Funder, 1980; John & Robins, 1993; McCrae et al., 1998).
Cues to look for

1. Cluttered vs. uncluttered
2. Organized vs. disorganized
3. Neat vs. messy
4. Well lit vs. dark overall
5. Full vs. empty
6. Modern vs. old-fashioned
7. Organized vs. disorganized books/CDs
8. Varied vs. homogenous books/magazines
9. Distinctive vs. Ordinary
10. Inviting vs. Repelling (office)
11. Decorated vs. Undecorated (office)
12. Organized vs. disorganized Magazines
13. Varied vs. homogenous CDs
14. Decorated vs. Undecorated
15. Colorful vs. drab
16. Clothing everywhere vs. none visible
17. Cheerful vs. gloomy
18. Inviting vs. repelling
Consensus Correlations

ROV WITH A CUE

Fisher-z Transformed Correlations (Zero-Order Correlations in Parentheses)

- Extraversion
- Agreeableness
- Conscientiousness
- Emotional Stability
- Openness

- Offices (Study 1)
- Bedrooms (Study 2)
- Zero-Acquaintance
- Long-term Acquaintance
What the cues are correlated with

- Conscientiousness
  1. Cluttered vs. uncluttered - .32
  2. Organized vs. disorganized .29
  3. Neat vs. messy .27
  4. Well lit vs. dark overall .26
  5. Full vs. empty -.26
  6. Modern vs. old-fashioned .24
  7. Organized vs. disorganized books/CDs .24/.27
What the cues are correlated with

• Openness
  8. Varied vs. homogenous books/magazines .44/.51
  9. Distinctive vs. Ordinary .35

• Extraversion
  10. Inviting vs. Repelling (office) .29
  11. Decorated vs. Undecorated (office) .27

• Agreeableness
  12. Organized vs. disorganized Magazines -.38
  13. Varied vs. homogenous CDs -.26
Those that also match up

14. Decorated vs. Undecorated (Extra .41/.06)
15. Colorful vs. drab (Agree .37/.05)
16. Clothing everywhere vs. none visible (Cons. -.57/-11)
17. Cheerful vs. gloomy (Agree .66/-05)
18. Inviting vs. repelling (Agree .52/.00)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFM personality dimensions</th>
<th>Question 1: Interobserver consensus (Mean $n = 68$)</th>
<th>Question 2: Observer accuracy ($n = 79$)</th>
<th>Question 3: Vector correlations ($n = 42$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interobserver consensus is the mean of the 21 correlations derived from all possible pairwise combinations of seven observers. Observer accuracy is the correlation between the aggregated observer ratings and the composite criterion ratings. The vector correlations reflect the convergence between the cue-utilization correlations and the cue-validity correlations. FFM = Five-Factor Model.

*a Significance of consensus correlations were based on sample size of 68, the average number of cases across which the correlations were computed. When consensus was determined from intraclass correlations using the subset of rooms for which there were no missing data, the pattern of findings was almost identical, with all dimensions except Emotional Stability reaching significance at the .01 level.

* $p < .05$, one-tailed. ** $p < .01$, one-tailed.
Conclusions

- Thus, it seems that personal environments contain richer sources of information from which to form impressions than are contained in zero-acquaintance contexts. This is especially true for openness to experience and conscientiousness.

- Information accumulated in personal environments is often the result of repeated behaviors. For example, to have an organized office it is not sufficient to organize the office just once; instead, the occupant must continually engage in organizing behaviors—returning the phone directory to the bookshelf after use, throwing away used paper cups, and placing documents in neat stacks. Multiple acts are more likely to have an impact on the environment than are single acts. Because environmental cues tend to reflect repeated acts, they may offer more reliable evidence than the few acts that observers witness in many zero-acquaintance contexts.