Psychology 360: Personality Research

William Revelle

Northwestern University

Fall, 2022

personality-project.org/courses/360.syllabus.pdf

Personality Research

- All people are the same, some people are the same, no person is the same. (Kluckhohn and Murray, 1948)
- “Whatever exists at all exists in some amount. To know it thoroughly involves knowing its quantity as well as its quality” (E.L. Thorndike, 1918)

Theory and Theory Testing I: Theory



Theory and Theory Testing II: Experimental manipulation



Theory and Theory Testing III: Correlational inference



Theory and Theory Testing IV: Correlational inference



Theory and Theory Testing V: Alternative Explanations



Individual differences and general laws



Theory and Theory Testing VI: Eliminate Alternative Explanations



Personality is the core discipline of psychology

Personality is the coherent patterning of affect, behavior, cognition and desire

- Personality: Stability and Change
  - How do we recognize an old friend?
  - Are we the same person we were 10 years ago?
  - Are we the same person we will be in 10 years?

Personality: the temporal coherence of affect, behavior, cognition and desire

- Personality as music: Recognizing a person is like recognizing a tune
- Recognition of an old tune
  - Notes may be different but if the pattern of notes is the same, it is the same tune
    - Melody
    - Rhythm
    - Lyrics
- Familiarity of an old friend
  - A person's recognizable signature is the pattern of
    - Affect
    - Behavior
    - Cognition
    - Desire
- Emotion is to Personality as weather is to climate

Personality: the temporal coherence of affect, behavior, cognition and desire

Five questions about personality

1. Generality across situations
2. Stability across time
3. Functioning (adaptive vs. maladaptive)
4. Causality (biological/nature + environmental/nuture)
5. Application (does it make any difference)

Dimensions of Explanation and Analysis

Generality

Species Typical — Individual Differences — Uniqueness

All people are the same — Some People are the same — No person is the same

Stability

(sec)

10^{-3} 10^{-2} 10^{-1} 10^{0} 10^{1} 10^{2} 10^{3} 10^{4} 10^{5} 10^{6} 10^{7} 10^{8} 10^{9}

Causality

Genetic predispositions Evolutionary selection

Biological substrates and constraints

Development: Learning and Experience

Cognitive Affective Structures

Life Meaning/ Identity

Functioning

Adaptive — Maladaptive

Application

Formal Models — Direct Application

Personality: the temporal dimension

Stability across 10^x sec

10^{-3} 10^{-2} 10^{-1} 10^{0} 10^{1} 10^{2} 10^{3} 10^{4} 10^{5} 10^{6} 10^{7} 10^{8} 10^{9}

Conventional units

1 10 100 1 10 ≈2 20 ≈3 ≈1 11 4 3 32

ms sec min hour days months years

Phenomena

Cognitive/ Linguistic processing

Emotional reactions

Mood states

Diurnal rhythms

Monthly Seasonal rhythms

Life Story

Personality Research: Generality x Levels of Analysis

- Generality
  - All people are the same -- species typical
  - Some people are the same -- individual differences
  - No person is the same-- individual uniqueness
- Levels of analysis
  - Genetic substrate
  - Physiological systems
  - Learning and Experience
  - Cognitive-Emotional structures
  - Life meaning and identity

A conceptual organization of personality theory and research



Early Personality Research

I. Gideon

II. Plato

III. Theophrastus

IV. Hippocrates/Galen

V. Galton/Wundt/Heymans

Gideon, master methodologist

I. introduced the within subjects design

II. recognized the power of cross over interactions

III. was not afraid of asking hard questions



Gideon's tests for God are an early example of a double dissociation and probably the first published example of a cross over interaction. On the first night, the wool was wet but the floor was dry. On the second night, the floor was wet but the wool was dry (Judges 6:36-40)

Gideon and assessment

I. The problem: 32,000 volunteers were too many for purpose

II. Solution: Sequential Affective and Cognitive Assessment

A) 10,000 passed the affective test (step back if you are afraid)

B) 300 passed the cognitive assessment (lapping water like a dog showing battlefield skill)

Gideon’s assessment technique



Plato's contribution to psychometrics and personality assessment

Plato's contribution to psychometrics and assessment

I. True Score theory

II. The Allegory of the Cave and latent variable analysis

III. The Republic: leadership effectiveness and the Giant 3: the role of intelligence, anxiety and impulsivity

Plato and latent variables: The allegory of the cave

Suppose that there is a group of human beings who have lived their entire lives trapped in a subterranean chamber lit by a large fire behind them. Chained in place, these cave-dwellers can see nothing but shadows (of their own bodies and of other things) projected on a flat wall in front of them. Some of these people will be content to do no more than notice the play of light and shadow, while the more clever among them will become highly skilled observers of the patterns that most regularly occur. In both cases, however, they cannot truly comprehend what they see, since they are prevented from grasping its true source and nature. (Republic 514a)

Plato and leadership

"... quick **intelligence**, **memory**, sagacity, **cleverness**, and similar qualities, do not often grow together, and that persons who possess them and are at the same time high-spirited and magnanimous are not so constituted by nature as to live orderly and in a peaceful and settled manner; they are driven any way by their **impulses**, and all solid principle goes out of them.

On the other hand, those steadfast natures which can better be depended upon, which in a battle are **impregnable to fear** and immovable, are equally immovable when there is anything to be learned; they are always in a torpid state, and are apt to yawn and go to sleep over any intellectual toil.

And yet we were saying that both qualities were necessary in those to whom the higher education is to be imparted, and who are to share in any office or command.

And will they be a class which is rarely found?

Then the aspirant must not only be tested in those labours and dangers and pleasures which we mentioned before, but there is another kind of probation which we did not mention--he must be exercised also in many kinds of **knowledge**, to see whether the soul will be able to endure the highest of all, or will faint under them, as in any other studies and exercises."



Tyrtamus of Lesbos (Theophrastus) biological taxonomist and taxonomist of character

Theophrastus: behavior genetics and taxonomic theory

"Often before now have I applied my thoughts to the puzzling question -- one, probably, which will puzzle me for ever -- why it is that, while all Greece lies under the same sky and all the Greeks are educated alike, it has befallen us to have characters so variously constituted."

Theophrastus, Chaucer and personality taxonomy

I. Theophrastus and the characters

II. Chaucer and the Cantebury Tales

Theophrastus meets Goldberg

Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientious	Neuroticism	Openness
Talkative	Sympathetic	Organized	Tense	Wide Interests
Assertive	Kind	Thorough	Anxious	Imaginative
Active	Appreciative	Planful	Nervous	Intelligent
Energetic	Affectionate	Efficient	Moody	Original
-Quiet	-Cold	-Careless	-Stable	-Commonplace
-Reserved	-Unfriendly	-Disorderly	-Calm	-Simple
Talker	Anxious to please	-Hostile	Coward	-Stupid
Chatty	Flatterer	-Shameless	Grumbler	-Superstitious
Boastful	-Unpleasant	-Distrustful	Mean	-Boor
Arrogant	-Outcast	-Avaricious	Unseasonable	-Gross

Goldberg, L. (1990); John, O. (1990); Theophrastus (372-287 BCE)

The biological basis of individual differences

I. Plato and the 3 domains of psychological research

A) Reason and the brain

B) Emotion and the heart

C) Desire and the liver

II. Hippocrates/Galen and theories of temperament

Galen of Pergamum





4 temperaments of Galen/Kant a recurring taxonomy

"element"	Physiological basis	Temperament
Fire	Yellow Bile	Choleric
Water	Phlegm	Phlegmatic
Air	Blood	Sanguine
Earth	Black Bile	Melancholic

Multiple representations of the 4 temperaments


Phlegmaticus
Cholericus
Sanguineus
Melancholicus


Septē
planete
Jupiter.
Mars.
Sol medius
Venus.
Mercurius
Luna.
Sanguis
humor
Menses hyemales
Aque
Frigiditas

Astrology and the four temperaments



Interest in the 4 temperaments continues today (c.f. wiki)



Wundt's dimensionsal analysis

	Changeability	
Exciteability	Melancholic	Choleric
	Phlegmatic	Sanguine

Eysenck's dimensional organization



Eysenck, H.J and Eysenck, M.W. *Personality and Individual Differences.*

Melancholic

Choleric

Phlegmatic

Sanguine

Individual differences come of age:
Measurement and experiments

I. Francis Galton and regression

II. Wilhelm Wundt and experimental methods

Francis Galton 1822-1911

- Study of Hereditary Genius
- Regression
- Individual Differences



Galton and Regression



Galton and Regression



Wilhelm Wundt 1832-1920

- Basic Experimental Paradigm
- 3 factor theory of emotion
- Hedonic theory

Gerard Heymans (1857-1930)

- Empirically based research
- 3 dimensions of personality



Gerard Heymans (1857-1930)

- Empirically based research
  - 3000 (Dutch) doctors were asked to rate all members of a family on a large number of traits
  - ≈ 400 responded with ratings on 2,523 subjects
- Three dimensions
  - Emotionality or Emotional Instability
  - Activity or general drive
  - Dominance of primary or secondary functioning

Heymans' taxonomy

(from Eysenck, 1992)

	Emotionality	Activity	P/S	Jung
Apathetic	-	-	S	Sensitive I
Amorphous	-	-	P	Intuitive I
Phlegmatic	-	+	S	Intuitive E
Sanguine	-	+	P	Sensitive E
Passionate	+	+	S	Thinking E
Choleric	+	+	P	Feeling E
Sentimental	+	-	S	Feeling I
Nervous	+	-	P	Thinking I

Multiple approaches to personality

1. Psychology of the individual
    1. Consistency and change in the life of a person
    2. Coherence over situations and time
2. Individual differences
    1. How many dimensions are needed?
    2. What are they?
3. Stability of individual differences over time
    - Does knowing about individuals in one situation predict anything about other situations

Identifying personality structure

Is it possible to reduce the broad range of individual variation in personality to a limited number of personality traits?

Trait: A particular feature of mind or character; a distinguishing quality; a characteristic; spec. of a culture or social group (OED)

The pronunciation tr *e*i, after mod. French , in the 19th c. considered in England the correct one, is becoming less general; in U.S. tr *e*it is the established one (OED)

Definition of the relevant domain

- Individual differences in personality
  - Personality traits vs. abilities?
  - Traditional personality traits are central tendencies and preferences rather than limits
  - What do you do vs. what can you do
- What do we want to know about ourselves or others?
  - what we do
  - what we can do

Descriptive Approaches to Personality

- Derived from three approaches to taxonomy construction
  - **Folk Theories**: How ordinary people think about personality – constrained to types and typologies; categorical, not dimensional
  - **Constructive** approach: How verbal **descriptions** of feelings and actions covary; leading to trait dimensions – constrained by interests and ingenuity of investigators
  - **Analytic** approaches : How endorsements of **words** covary, leading to trait dimensions – constrained by the language
- All seek to provide a characterization of kinds of people (a flatterer, extravert, etc.); all are only a first approximation for what a person will do (next)

Theophrastus' Folk Theory

The talker	The anxious to please	The hostile man
The chatterer	The toady or the flatterer	The shameless man
The boaster	The coward	The distrustful man
The inventor of news	The superstitious man	The slanderer
The ironical man	The feckless	The skinflint or stingy man
The boor	The tiresome man	The mean man
The arrogant man	The outcast	The avaricious man

Early theoretical taxonomies

- Plato and the requirement for leadership

" ... quick **intelligence**, memory, sagacity, cleverness, and similar qualities, do not often grow together, and ... persons who possess them and are at the same time **high-spirited** and **magnanimous** are not so constituted by nature as to live in an orderly and peaceful and settled manner; they are driven any way by their **impulses**, and all solid principle goes out of them. ... On the other hand, those **stable** and **steadfast** and, it seems, more **trustworthy** natures, which in a battle are **impregnable to fear** and immovable, are equally immovable when there is anything to be learned; they are always in a torpid state, and are apt to yawn and go to sleep over any intellectual toil."

Early taxonomies

- Hippocrates (publicized by Galen): “Blood,phlegm, yellow bile and black bile are the particular elements of the nature of man”.
- the sanguine, bouyant type; the phlegmatic, sluggish type; the choleric, quick-tempered type; and the melancholic, dejected type
- The 4 temperaments were later discussed by Kant (1798)

19th Century Taxonomy: Wundt's dimensional structure of the 4 temperaments

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Excitable</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Melancholic</td><td>Choleric</td><td rowspan="2">Changeable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Phlegmatic</td><td>Sanguine</td></tr>
</table>

Melancholic

Choleric



Phlegmatic

Sanguine

Early 20th century taxonomies

- Heymans - 3 dimensional model
  - data driven!
- Freud:
  - Interaction of character and childrearing
- Jung:
  - Orientations and functioning
- McDougall domains of personality

Heymans

- Empirically based research
  - 3000 (Dutch) doctors were asked to rate all members of a family on a large number of traits
  - ≈ 400 responded with ratings on 2,523 subjects
- Three dimensions
  - Emotionality or Emotional Instability
  - Activity or general drive
  - Dominance of primary or secondary functioning

Heymans' taxonomy

(from Eysenck, 1992)

	Emotionality	Activity	P/S	Jung
Apathetic	-	-	S	Sensitive I
Amorphous	-	-	P	Intuitive I
Phlegmatic	-	+	S	Intuitive E
Sanguine	-	+	P	Sensitive E
Passionate	+	+	S	Thinking E
Choleric	+	+	P	Feeling E
Sentimental	+	-	S	Feeling I
Nervous	+	-	P	Thinking I

Freud's taxonomy

- Oral
  - Indulgent: oral erotic -- oral passive optimistic, gullible, dependent, manipulative
  - Restrictive: oral sadistic, oral aggressive pessimistic, suspicious, quarrelsome
- Anal
  - Indulgent: anal retentive, anal compulsive stingy, stubborn, punctual, precise, orderly
  - Restrictive: anal aggressive, anal expulsive cruel, destructive, hostile, disorderly
- Phallic
  - Indulgent: phallic-dominant vain, proud, domineering, ambitious, virile
  - Restrictive: phallic-submissive meek, submissive, modest, timid, feminine

Jung

- Orientations:
  - Introverted Extraverted
- Psychological Functioning
  - Thinking/Feeling
  - Judging/Perceiving
  - Sensing/ Intuiting
- (current application, loosely based upon Jung's typology is the MBTI)

McDougall

- Intellect
- Character
- Temperament
- Disposition
- Temper

Popular culture extensions

- Many simple taxonomies loosely based upon Jung/Galen to describe individual differences
- Popular among group facilitators to show that people differ, with an emphasis that everyone has unique talents
- Practically cult like following of MBTI with people referring to themselves in terms of 4 term abbreviations

Taxonomic problems

- Except for Heymans, based more upon clinical judgment and description rather than systematic analysis of variation.
- It is easy to create 2 x 2 x 2 descriptions of others.
  - (Traits my friends and I have vs those of people I don't like X traits I have versus my friend X traits of some friends versus other friends)

Constructive Approach (Rational scale construction)

- Propensities to particular behaviors are captured by verbal descriptions
- Researchers construct items with a view to capturing/predicting phenomena of interest
- Empirical application of item responses to solve specific prediction problems

Representative Items
(constructive approach)

Do you like to go to lively parties?

Do you do and say things without stopping to think?

Would you call yourself a nervous person?

Do you like to go to the opera?

Analytic Approach (1950 – 1960s)

- Based on factor analysis of endorsement patterns of **words** (e.g., Allport, Cattell, Norman, Goldberg)

- Earliest systematic analyses were Cattell's
  - 18,000 English words intuitively grouped into ≈ 45 pairs of categories or "trait complexes" eventually reduced to 12-14 primary dimensions

- Most ambitious attempt: Warren Norman (1967)
  - selected a subset of about 2,800 from 40,000 English words representing variations between persons or within individuals over time and varying situations . . . encoded in the language

The lexical hypothesis

- based on the following rationale: Because they are so socially meaningful, personality attributes tend to acquire lexical representation, and degree of lexical representation is one guide to the importance of a personality dimension. Presumably, those dimensions that are most fundamental will be ubiquitous, and therefore can be derived independently from studies of any language.
  - (Saucier)

Lexical Hypothesis: Allport

- trait terms selected from unabridged dictionary
- 18,000 Allport-Odbert word lists
  - stable traits
  - fluctuating states

Lexical Hypothesis: Cattell

selected words from Allport 4,504

grouped by semantic meaning 171

formed intuitive clusters 36-46

factored rating scales 12-14

Subjects: Univ. Illinois fraternity members

early use of factor analysis formed personality instruments 14-16 self report scales

Representative Trait Complexes

(from Cattell, 1957)

1. *Adaptable*: flexible; accepts changes of plan easily; satisfied with compromises; is not upset, surprised, baffled, or irritated if things are different from what he expected	V s	*Rigid*: insists that things be done the way he has always done them; does not adapt his habits and ways of thinking to those of the group; nonplussed if his routine is upset
2. *Emotional*: excitable; cries a lot (children), laughs a lot, shows affection, anger, all emotions, to excess	V s	*Calm*: stable; shows few signs of emotional excitement of any kind; remains calm, even underreacts, in dispute, danger, social hilarity
3. *Conscientious*: honest; knows what is right and generally does not tell lies or attempt to deceive others; respects others' property	V s	*Unconscientious*: somewhat unscrupulous; not too careful about standards of right and wrong where personal desires are concerned; tells lies and is given to little deceits; does not respect others' property
4. *Conventional*: conforms to accepted standards, ways of acting, thinking, dressing, etc.; does the "proper" thing; seems distressed if he finds he is being different	V s	*Unconventional, Eccentric*: acts differently from others; not concerned about wearing the same clothes as others; has somewhat eccentric interests, attitudes, and ways of behaving; goes his own rather peculiar way

Reanalyses and extensions of Cattell

- Fiske, 1948 - 5 factors
- Tupes and Christal (1958) 5 factors of peer ratings
- Norman (1963) 5 Factors of peer ratings: The "Big 5"
  - 1. Surgency/Extraversion
  - 2. Agreeableness
  - 3. Conscientiousness
  - 4. Emotional Stability versus Emotionality
  - 5. Culture/Openness
- Digman (1985) 5 factors of ratings (teachers + peers)

Digman's Six Data Sets

Oahu 1st & 2nd grades (N = 885): 49 traits

Oahu 5th & 6th grades (N = 834): 49 traits

Kauai 6th grades (N = 502): 43 traits

39 common traits (N = 2,221)

University of Hawaii Laboratory School:

1959 1st & 2nd grades (N = 102): 36 traits

1960 1st,2nd,& 3rd (N = 149): 50 traits

1963 5th & 6th grades (N = 100): 63 traits

(from Goldberg, 2004)

The Digman-Hawaii Teacher Assessments

The child personality traits were selected to be a comprehensive set, covering at least 10 broad factors.

Each personality trait was specified by classroom behaviors formulated with the help of focus groups of elementary-school teachers.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Examples of Two Personality Trait Descriptions

Gregarious: Likes to be with others and seeks their company; spends as much time with others as possible; dislikes being alone.

Persevering: Keeps at his/her work until it is completed; sees a job through despite difficulties; painstaking and thorough.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Digman's Preliminary Analyses of Some of These Data

Published in Digman & Takemoto-Chock (1981); Digman & Inouye (1986); and Digman (1989):

10 to 12 factors were hypothesized.

But only 5 factors replicated across samples.

These early findings were influential in popularizing the "Big-Five" factor structure.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Reanalyses of Digman's Child Data Sets (Goldberg, 2001)

- Data from the 6 separate samples of elementary school children were analyzed independently.
- Across the 6 samples, the factors were compared at each hierarchical level, from one-factor to 10-factors.
- In each of the 6 samples, the classic "Big-Five" factor structure was found.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

A Middle-Childhood "Big-Five"

I. Extraversion:

Gregarious, Energetic vs. Seclusive, Lethargic

II. Agreeableness:

Humble vs. Rude, Self-centered

III. Conscientiousness:

Persevering, Planful, Careful vs. Irresponsible

IV. Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism):

Fearful, Tense, Concerned about acceptance

V. Intellect:

Original, Imaginative, Curious, Aesthetic

(from Goldberg, 2004)

The Hierarchical Structure of Childhood Personality Traits



(from Goldberg, 2004)

Five Domains of Personality (1980s-1990s)

Analyses and meta-analyses of constructive and analytic approaches converged on five domains (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Goldberg,1981; John, 1990)

technical domain name	**colloquial domain name**
Extraversion (surgency)	Power
Agreeableness	Affection
Conscientiousness	Work
Neuroticism	Emotionality
Openness	Intellect

***

Representative Trait Words by Domain

extraversion	agreeableness	conscientious	neuroticism	openness
talkative	sympathetic	organized	tense	wide interests
assertive	kind	thorough	anxious	imaginative
active	appreciative	planful	nervous	intelligent
energetic	affectionate	efficient	moody	original
-quiet	-cold	-careless	-stable	-commonplace
-reserved	-unfriendly	-disorderly	-calm	-simple
-shy	-quarrelsome	-frivolous	-contented	-shallow
-silent	-hard-headed	-irresponsible	-unemotional	-unintelligent

The Giant 3, Big 5, Small 11



(adapted from Ackerman and Heggestad, 1997)

Circumplex of Big 5 dimensions (Abridged Big 5 Circumplex)

- Pair wise ordering of dimensions
  - Agreeableness x Extraversion (interpersonal circumplex of Wiggins)
  - Neuroticism x Extraversion (affective circumplex)
  - Neuroticism x Conscientiousness (the personality disorders?)
  - Agreeableness x Conscientiousness (psychoticism?)
- Comparisons of Self/Other and Positive/Negative Affect
  - a speculative organization
- An alternative would be to organize in terms of Affect, Behavior, Cognition, and Desires

Neuroticism x Extraversion Affective Circumplex (S^+/S^-)



Agreeableness x Extraversion Interpersonal Circumplex (S^+/O^+)



Neuroticism x Conscientiousness (S^-/O^-) : The personality Disorders?



Agreeableness x Conscientiousness (O^+/O^-): Eysenck's P scale = O^+ vs. O^-)?



Conscientiousness x Extraversion Circumplex (S^{+}/O^{-})



But is Big 5 structure of what people say, not what people do

- Is this the psychology of the stranger?
- Is it merely dimensions of semantic lexicon
- Are personality traits mere delusions?
- (The need for validity studies)

Personality traits as a delusion

- Hartshorn and May (1930)
  - Studies in character -- low correlations across situations for honesty
- Newcomb (1931)
  - Low correlations between real time ratings of behaviors
- Passini and Norman (1966) structure of strangers
- Mischel (1968) critique
- Shweder and D'Andrade (1980) personality as shared delusions
- (This thread continues until today in many classes in social psychology)

Newcomb's behavioral study

rated by camp counselors during the day and at end of day

1. Tells of his own past of the exploits he has accomplished
2. Gives loud and spontaneous expressions of delight or disapproval
3. Goes beyond only asking and answering necessary questions in conversations with counselors.
4. How is the quiet time spent?
5. Spends a lot of time talking at the table.

Newcomb's summer camp 1931

- Systematic encoding by camp counselors of immediate behaviors and subsequent ratings

Behavior	1	2	3	4	5
1	-	0.52	0.05	0.29	0.2
2	0.67	-	0.03	-0.14	0.08
3	0.61	0.68	-	-0.11	0.48
4	0.97	0.88	0.66	-	0.16
5	0.66	0.92	0.77	0.75	-

Passini and Norman

- Structure of strangers
  - Undergraduates rating other (unknown) undergraduates on 20 paragraph descriptors
  - Big 5 structure emerges
  - Is the structure of personality traits merely the structure of the lexicon, not of people?
- See also Mulaik structure of ratings of adjectives

Shweder and D'Andrande (1980)

- Method:
  - ratings taken of behavior at time it occurs ("on line")
  - ratings done from memory semantic
  - judgments of similarity of trait words
- Analysis
  - Compare(correlate) the correlation matrices from the three procedures

Comparisons of Correlational Structures

On line ratings

Memory based ratings



Semantic similarity ratings


error
error
E'
$r_{E'}$
r_E
E
r_{ME}
Behavior
Encoding
Method
a
b
Semantics
c
Memory
r_S
r_M
S
M
error
error

Shweder and D'Andrande

- Results
  - structure of "on line measures" not the same as memory based
  - structure of memory based equivalent to semantic structure
- Implication: structure of personality ratings is in mind of beholder, not in the behavior of target
- But: "on line" measures were forced choice!

Romer and Revelle (1984)

- Conceptual replication of Shweder's "on line ratings”
- Varied "on line ratings"
  - Presented “behavior” e.g. “Rick was self confident at the meeting”
    - forced choice (ala Shweder)
      - which trait does this behavior represent (dominant, arrogant, cold, introverted, submissive, unassuming, warm, extraverted)

    complete rating of all traits (same traits as before)

  Semantic structure ratings: how X is this behavior Y?

structure of "on line ratings" depends upon method

forced choice categories do not correlate

on line ratings of traits match memory based

See also Borkenau et al.

Comparisons of Correlational Structures



Romer and Revelle (1984)

Results of Experiment for Each Observer

Observer	$\bar{\alpha}$	Correlations between: Immediate coding and memory rating[a]	Immediate and memory matrices[b] r	Immediate and memory matrices[b] r_S	Immediate and semantics matrices[b] r	Immediate and semantics matrices[b] r_S	Memory and semantics matrices[b] r	Memory and semantics matrices[b] r_S
Identification condition								
A	.93	.66	.31	.26	.19	.27	.74	.79
B	.84	.30	.43	.22	.43	.33	.73	.74
C	.82	.65	.53	.58	.49	.49	.67	.69
D	.79	.40	.52	.57	.49	.48	.53	.57
M	.85	.50	.45	.41	.40	.39	.67	.70
Scaling condition								
E	.95	.82	.99	.98	.73	.72	.74	.70
F	.95	.95	.99	.96	.71	.74	.73	.73
G	.91	.11	.92	.86	.76	.79	.62	.73
H	.81	.36	.74	.72	.65	.74	.43	.45
M	.91	.56	.91	.88	.71	.75	.63	.65

Note Correlations between immediate, memory and semantics matrices are reported with Pearson (r) and Spearman (r_S) coefficients.

[a] $N = 64$. [b] $N = 28$.

Norman and Goldberg (1966) Construct validity of structure

- Comparison of interrater agreement as rater-ratee interaction increases
- Levels of interaction
  - Unknown (empty chair- Monte Carlo simulation)
  - Minimal acquaintance (Passini and Norman)
  - ROTC members
  - Fraternity juniors and Seniors
  - Peace Corp Trainees
- Structures remain the same across groups, but interrater agreement increases



FIG. 1. r_s and r_i for average of all 20 scales. P and N = Passini and Norman data, PCT = Peace Corps trainee data, FRSR = fraternity senior data.



FIG. 2. r_i for averaged subsets of factor-marker scales. P and N = Passini and Norman data, PCT = Peace Corps trainee data, FRSR = fraternity senior data.

Mid - late 20th Century Measurement and theory testing

I. John Atkinson

II. Donald Broadbent

III. Raymond Cattell

IV. Hans Eysenck

V. Jeffrey Gray

John Atkinson
1924-2003

I. Theory of Achievement Motivation

A) Individual differences and general laws

B) Theory testing through experimentation

II. Theory of the Dynamics of Action

C) Inertial properties of motivations and desires

D) Introduced the concept of personality traits as rates of change in psychological states

Donald E. Broadbent
1926-1993

I. Cognitive experiments showed individual differences interacting with situational determinants of attention and performance

II. Experimental work on arousal theory inspired work by Eysenck and others

Raymond Cattell

1905- 1998

Founding President:
Society for Multivariate
Experimental Psychology



- Primarily multivariate, little "experimental"

Hans J. Eysenck

1916-1997

Founding President: International Society for the Study of Individual Differences





Cronbach, Eysenck and the two disciplines of scientific psychology

I. Cronbach (1957, 1975) and Eysenck (1966, 1983, 1997) argued for the unification of the two disciplines of experimental and correlational approaches

II. Is it possible?

III. Are we doing it?

Is it possible to do Experimental Personality?

I. Individuals can not be assigned to personality conditions

II. Experimental designs test person x condition interactions

III. Can combine general laws with theories of individual differences

Few studies with experimental techniques or that study IQ are reported in our journals

Journal	Total	Exper.	IQ	Exp%	IQ%
EJP	68	0	2	0	3
JoP	125	7	1	6	1
JPSP	280	26	3	9	1
PaID	586	73	47	12	8
JRP	102	16	1	16	1
JPSP-PID	92	26	3	28	3

Revelle, W. and Oehlberg, K. (in press) Integrating experimental and observational personality research: the contribution of Hans Eysenck , Journal of Personality.

The basic logic of a personality experiment



Observed paths (A-H) are estimates of latent paths (a-h) and are affected by reliability (r, s, t)

Testing Personality Theory with experimental methods

I. Eysenck's theory of extraversion and arousal

A) Preferences

B) Performance

II. Gray's theory of sensitivity to reward and punishment cues

Eysenck and Wundt curve



Eysenck (1967) + Hebb (1954) + Yerkes/Dodson (1908)



Experiments test limits of generality

I. If a personality dimension interacts with a manipulation, then we are able to define the limits of the individual difference

II. Interactions allow us to exclude alternative hypotheses

Introversion and cognitive performance

I. Introverts do better on exams in relaxed conditions than extraverts.

II. Is this because they are smarter?

III. No, because experimentally we can show this effect reverses under time stress and caffeine

Introversion, time pressure, and caffeine: effect on verbal performance

Standardized for NU

Introverts

Ambiverts

Extraverts

Revelle, Amaral, & Turriff, 1976 Science

Does this support Eysenck's hypothesis?

I. Yes, but further studies limit this effect and show an interaction with time of day

II. This interaction tests and finds the limit of the overall trait effect

Impulsivity, Caffeine, and Time of Day: the effect on complex cognitive performance



Revelle, Humphreys, Simon and Gilliland, JEP:G, 1980

Impulsivity, Caffeine, and Time of Day: the effect on complex cognitive performance



Revelle, Humphreys, Simon and Gilliland, JEP:G, 1980

Extraversion vs. Impulsivity

- Caffeine effects are systematic, but not for extraversion, but rather for impulsivity
- Systematic interaction with time of day
- Implications
  - Performance does vary as function of personality and arousal, but depends upon time of day
  - Personality dimension of relevance was impulsivity
- Experimental studies allowed us to limit the generalization of the personality trait

Multiple approaches to personality

1. Psychology of the individual
   1. Consistency and change in the life of a person
   2. Coherence over situations and time
2. Individual differences
   1. How many dimensions are needed?
   2. What are they?
3. Stability of individual differences over time
   - Does knowing about individuals in one situation predict anything about other situations

Identifying personality structure

Is it possible to reduce the broad range of individual variation in personality to a limited number of personality traits?

Trait: A particular feature of mind or character; a distinguishing quality; a characteristic; spec. of a culture or social group (OED)

The pronunciation tr *e*i, after mod. French , in the 19th c. considered in England the correct one, is becoming less general; in U.S. tr *e*it is the established one (OED)

Definition of the relevant domain

- Individual differences in personality
  - Personality traits vs. abilities?
  - Traditional personality traits are central tendencies and preferences rather than limits
  - What do you do vs. what can you do
- What do we want to know about ourselves or others?
  - what we do
  - what we can do

Descriptive Approaches to Personality

- Derived from three approaches to taxonomy construction
  - **Folk Theories**: How ordinary people think about personality – constrained to types and typologies; categorical, not dimensional
  - **Constructive** approach: How verbal **descriptions** of feelings and actions covary; leading to trait dimensions – constrained by interests and ingenuity of investigators
  - **Analytic** approaches : How endorsements of **words** covary, leading to trait dimensions – constrained by the language
- All seek to provide a characterization of kinds of people (a flatterer, extravert, etc.); all are only a first approximation for what a person will do (next)

Theophrastus' Folk Theory

The talker	The anxious to please	The hostile man
The chatterer	The toady or the flatterer	The shameless man
The boaster	The coward	The distrustful man
The inventor of news	The superstitious man	The slanderer
The ironical man	The feckless	The skinflint or stingy man
The boor	The tiresome man	The mean man
The arrogant man	The outcast	The avaricious man

Early theoretical taxonomies

- Plato and the requirement for leadership

" ... quick **intelligence**, memory, sagacity, cleverness, and similar qualities, do not often grow together, and ... persons who possess them and are at the same time **high-spirited** and **magnanimous** are not so constituted by nature as to live in an orderly and peaceful and settled manner; they are driven any way by their **impulses**, and all solid principle goes out of them. ... On the other hand, those **stable** and **steadfast** and, it seems, more **trustworthy** natures, which in a battle are **impregnable to fear** and immovable, are equally immovable when there is anything to be learned; they are always in a torpid state, and are apt to yawn and go to sleep over any intellectual toil."

Early taxonomies

- Hippocrates (publicized by Galen): “Blood,phlegm, yellow bile and black bile are the particular elements of the nature of man”.
- the sanguine, bouyant type; the phlegmatic, sluggish type; the choleric, quick-tempered type; and the melancholic, dejected type
- The 4 temperaments were later discussed by Kant (1798)

19th Century Taxonomy: Wundt's dimensional structure of the 4 temperaments

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Excitable</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Melancholic</td><td>Choleric</td><td rowspan="2">Changeable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Phlegmatic</td><td>Sanguine</td></tr>
</table>

Melancholic

Choleric



Phlegmatic

Sanguine

Early 20th century taxonomies

- Heymans - 3 dimensional model
  - data driven!
- Freud:
  - Interaction of character and childrearing
- Jung:
  - Orientations and functioning
- McDougall domains of personality

Heymans

- Empirically based research
  - 3000 (Dutch) doctors were asked to rate all members of a family on a large number of traits
  - ≈ 400 responded with ratings on 2,523 subjects
- Three dimensions
  - Emotionality or Emotional Instability
  - Activity or general drive
  - Dominance of primary or secondary functioning

Heymans' taxonomy

(from Eysenck, 1992)

	Emotionality	Activity	P/S	Jung
Apathetic	-	-	S	Sensitive I
Amorphous	-	-	P	Intuitive I
Phlegmatic	-	+	S	Intuitive E
Sanguine	-	+	P	Sensitive E
Passionate	+	+	S	Thinking E
Choleric	+	+	P	Feeling E
Sentimental	+	-	S	Feeling I
Nervous	+	-	P	Thinking I

Freud's taxonomy

- Oral
  - Indulgent: oral erotic -- oral passive optimistic, gullible, dependent, manipulative
  - Restrictive: oral sadistic, oral aggressive pessimistic, suspicious, quarrelsome
- Anal
  - Indulgent: anal retentive, anal compulsive stingy, stubborn, punctual, precise, orderly
  - Restrictive: anal aggressive, anal expulsive cruel, destructive, hostile, disorderly
- Phallic
  - Indulgent: phallic-dominant vain, proud, domineering, ambitious, virile
  - Restrictive: phallic-submissive meek, submissive, modest, timid, feminine

Jung

- Orientations:
  - Introverted Extraverted
- Psychological Functioning
  - Thinking/Feeling
  - Judging/Perceiving
  - Sensing/ Intuiting
- (current application, loosely based upon Jung's typology is the MBTI)

McDougall

- Intellect
- Character
- Temperament
- Disposition
- Temper

Popular culture extensions

- Many simple taxonomies loosely based upon Jung/Galen to describe individual differences
- Popular among group facilitators to show that people differ, with an emphasis that everyone has unique talents
- Practically cult like following of MBTI with people referring to themselves in terms of 4 term abbreviations

Taxonomic problems

- Except for Heymans, based more upon clinical judgment and description rather than systematic analysis of variation.
- It is easy to create 2 x 2 x 2 descriptions of others.
  - (Traits my friends and I have vs those of people I don't like X traits I have versus my friend X traits of some friends versus other friends)

Constructive Approach (Rational scale construction)

- Propensities to particular behaviors are captured by verbal descriptions
- Researchers construct items with a view to capturing/predicting phenomena of interest
- Empirical application of item responses to solve specific prediction problems

Representative Items
(constructive approach)

Do you like to go to lively parties?

Do you do and say things without stopping to think?

Would you call yourself a nervous person?

Do you like to go to the opera?

Analytic Approach (1950 – 1960s)

- Based on factor analysis of endorsement patterns of **words** (e.g., Allport, Cattell, Norman, Goldberg)

- Earliest systematic analyses were Cattell's
  - 18,000 English words intuitively grouped into ≈ 45 pairs of categories or "trait complexes" eventually reduced to 12-14 primary dimensions

- Most ambitious attempt: Warren Norman (1967)
  - selected a subset of about 2,800 from 40,000 English words representing variations between persons or within individuals over time and varying situations . . . encoded in the language

The lexical hypothesis

- based on the following rationale: Because they are so socially meaningful, personality attributes tend to acquire lexical representation, and degree of lexical representation is one guide to the importance of a personality dimension. Presumably, those dimensions that are most fundamental will be ubiquitous, and therefore can be derived independently from studies of any language.
  - (Saucier)

Lexical Hypothesis: Allport

- trait terms selected from unabridged dictionary
- 18,000 Allport-Odbert word lists
  - stable traits
  - fluctuating states

Lexical Hypothesis: Cattell

selected words from Allport 4,504

grouped by semantic meaning 171

formed intuitive clusters 36-46

factored rating scales 12-14

Subjects: Univ. Illinois fraternity members

early use of factor analysis formed personality instruments 14-16 self report scales

Representative Trait Complexes

(from Cattell, 1957)

1. *Adaptable*: flexible; accepts changes of plan easily; satisfied with compromises; is not upset, surprised, baffled, or irritated if things are different from what he expected	V s	*Rigid*: insists that things be done the way he has always done them; does not adapt his habits and ways of thinking to those of the group; nonplussed if his routine is upset
2. *Emotional*: excitable; cries a lot (children), laughs a lot, shows affection, anger, all emotions, to excess	V s	*Calm*: stable; shows few signs of emotional excitement of any kind; remains calm, even underreacts, in dispute, danger, social hilarity
3. *Conscientious*: honest; knows what is right and generally does not tell lies or attempt to deceive others; respects others' property	V s	*Unconscientious*: somewhat unscrupulous; not too careful about standards of right and wrong where personal desires are concerned; tells lies and is given to little deceits; does not respect others' property
4. *Conventional*: conforms to accepted standards, ways of acting, thinking, dressing, etc.; does the "proper" thing; seems distressed if he finds he is being different	V s	*Unconventional, Eccentric*: acts differently from others; not concerned about wearing the same clothes as others; has somewhat eccentric interests, attitudes, and ways of behaving; goes his own rather peculiar way

Reanalyses and extensions of Cattell

- Fiske, 1948 - 5 factors
- Tupes and Christal (1958) 5 factors of peer ratings
- Norman (1963) 5 Factors of peer ratings: The "Big 5"
  - 1. Surgency/Extraversion
  - 2. Agreeableness
  - 3. Conscientiousness
  - 4. Emotional Stability versus Emotionality
  - 5. Culture/Openness
- Digman (1985) 5 factors of ratings (teachers + peers)

Digman's Six Data Sets

Oahu 1st & 2nd grades (N = 885): 49 traits

Oahu 5th & 6th grades (N = 834): 49 traits

Kauai 6th grades (N = 502): 43 traits

39 common traits (N = 2,221)

University of Hawaii Laboratory School:

1959 1st & 2nd grades (N = 102): 36 traits

1960 1st,2nd,& 3rd (N = 149): 50 traits

1963 5th & 6th grades (N = 100): 63 traits

(from Goldberg, 2004)

The Digman-Hawaii Teacher Assessments

The child personality traits were selected to be a comprehensive set, covering at least 10 broad factors.

Each personality trait was specified by classroom behaviors formulated with the help of focus groups of elementary-school teachers.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Examples of Two Personality Trait Descriptions

Gregarious: Likes to be with others and seeks their company; spends as much time with others as possible; dislikes being alone.

Persevering: Keeps at his/her work until it is completed; sees a job through despite difficulties; painstaking and thorough.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Digman's Preliminary Analyses of Some of These Data

Published in Digman & Takemoto-Chock (1981); Digman & Inouye (1986); and Digman (1989):

10 to 12 factors were hypothesized.

But only 5 factors replicated across samples.

These early findings were influential in popularizing the "Big-Five" factor structure.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

Reanalyses of Digman's Child Data Sets (Goldberg, 2001)

- Data from the 6 separate samples of elementary school children were analyzed independently.
- Across the 6 samples, the factors were compared at each hierarchical level, from one-factor to 10-factors.
- In each of the 6 samples, the classic "Big-Five" factor structure was found.

(from Goldberg, 2004)

A Middle-Childhood "Big-Five"

I. Extraversion:

Gregarious, Energetic vs. Seclusive, Lethargic

II. Agreeableness:

Humble vs. Rude, Self-centered

III. Conscientiousness:

Persevering, Planful, Careful vs. Irresponsible

IV. Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism):

Fearful, Tense, Concerned about acceptance

V. Intellect:

Original, Imaginative, Curious, Aesthetic

(from Goldberg, 2004)

The Hierarchical Structure of Childhood Personality Traits



(from Goldberg, 2004)

Five Domains of Personality (1980s-1990s)

Analyses and meta-analyses of constructive and analytic approaches converged on five domains (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Goldberg,1981; John, 1990)

technical domain name	**colloquial domain name**
Extraversion (surgency)	Power
Agreeableness	Affection
Conscientiousness	Work
Neuroticism	Emotionality
Openness	Intellect

***

Representative Trait Words by Domain

extraversion	agreeableness	conscientious	neuroticism	openness
talkative	sympathetic	organized	tense	wide interests
assertive	kind	thorough	anxious	imaginative
active	appreciative	planful	nervous	intelligent
energetic	affectionate	efficient	moody	original
-quiet	-cold	-careless	-stable	-commonplace
-reserved	-unfriendly	-disorderly	-calm	-simple
-shy	-quarrelsome	-frivolous	-contented	-shallow
-silent	-hard-headed	-irresponsible	-unemotional	-unintelligent

The Giant 3, Big 5, Small 11



(adapted from Ackerman and Heggestad, 1997)

Circumplex of Big 5 dimensions (Abridged Big 5 Circumplex)

- Pair wise ordering of dimensions
  - Agreeableness x Extraversion (interpersonal circumplex of Wiggins)
  - Neuroticism x Extraversion (affective circumplex)
  - Neuroticism x Conscientiousness (the personality disorders?)
  - Agreeableness x Conscientiousness (psychoticism?)
- Comparisons of Self/Other and Positive/Negative Affect
  - a speculative organization
- An alternative would be to organize in terms of Affect, Behavior, Cognition, and Desires

Neuroticism x Extraversion Affective Circumplex (S^+/S^-)



Agreeableness x Extraversion Interpersonal Circumplex (S^+/O^+)



Neuroticism x Conscientiousness (S^-/O^-) : The personality Disorders?



Agreeableness x Conscientiousness (O^+/O^-): Eysenck's P scale = O^+ vs. O^-)?



Conscientiousness x Extraversion Circumplex (S^{+}/O^{-})



But is Big 5 structure of what people say, not what people do

- Is this the psychology of the stranger?
- Is it merely dimensions of semantic lexicon
- Are personality traits mere delusions?
- (The need for validity studies)

Personality traits as a delusion

- Hartshorn and May (1930)
  - Studies in character -- low correlations across situations for honesty
- Newcomb (1931)
  - Low correlations between real time ratings of behaviors
- Passini and Norman (1966) structure of strangers
- Mischel (1968) critique
- Shweder and D'Andrade (1980) personality as shared delusions
- (This thread continues until today in many classes in social psychology)

Newcomb's behavioral study

rated by camp counselors during the day and at end of day

1. Tells of his own past of the exploits he has accomplished
2. Gives loud and spontaneous expressions of delight or disapproval
3. Goes beyond only asking and answering necessary questions in conversations with counselors.
4. How is the quiet time spent?
5. Spends a lot of time talking at the table.

Newcomb's summer camp 1931

- Systematic encoding by camp counselors of immediate behaviors and subsequent ratings

Behavior	1	2	3	4	5
1	-	0.52	0.05	0.29	0.2
2	0.67	-	0.03	-0.14	0.08
3	0.61	0.68	-	-0.11	0.48
4	0.97	0.88	0.66	-	0.16
5	0.66	0.92	0.77	0.75	-

Passini and Norman

- Structure of strangers
  - Undergraduates rating other (unknown) undergraduates on 20 paragraph descriptors
  - Big 5 structure emerges
  - Is the structure of personality traits merely the structure of the lexicon, not of people?
- See also Mulaik structure of ratings of adjectives

Shweder and D'Andrande (1980)

- Method:
  - ratings taken of behavior at time it occurs ("on line")
  - ratings done from memory semantic
  - judgments of similarity of trait words
- Analysis
  - Compare(correlate) the correlation matrices from the three procedures

Comparisons of Correlational Structures

On line ratings

Memory based ratings



Semantic similarity ratings

Shweder and D'Andrande

- Results
  - structure of "on line measures" not the same as memory based
  - structure of memory based equivalent to semantic structure
- Implication: structure of personality ratings is in mind of beholder, not in the behavior of target
- But: "on line" measures were forced choice!

Romer and Revelle (1984)

- Conceptual replication of Shweder's "on line ratings”
- Varied "on line ratings"
  - Presented “behavior” e.g. “Rick was self confident at the meeting”
    - forced choice (ala Shweder)
      - which trait does this behavior represent (dominant, arrogant, cold, introverted, submissive, unassuming, warm, extraverted)

    complete rating of all traits (same traits as before)

  Semantic structure ratings: how X is this behavior Y?

structure of "on line ratings" depends upon method

forced choice categories do not correlate

on line ratings of traits match memory based

See also Borkenau et al.


error
error
E'
rE'
rE
E
rME
Behavior
Encoding
Method
a
b
Semantics
c
Memory
rS
rM
S
M
error
error

Comparisons of Correlational Structures



Results of Experiment for Each Observer

Observer	$\bar{\alpha}$	Correlations between: Immediate coding and memory rating[a]	Immediate and memory matrices[b] r	Immediate and memory matrices[b] r_S	Immediate and semantics matrices[b] r	Immediate and semantics matrices[b] r_S	Memory and semantics matrices[b] r	Memory and semantics matrices[b] r_S
Identification condition								
A	.93	.66	.31	.26	.19	.27	.74	.79
B	.84	.30	.43	.22	.43	.33	.73	.74
C	.82	.65	.53	.58	.49	.49	.67	.69
D	.79	.40	.52	.57	.49	.48	.53	.57
M	.85	.50	.45	.41	.40	.39	.67	.70
Scaling condition								
E	.95	.82	.99	.98	.73	.72	.74	.70
F	.95	.95	.99	.96	.71	.74	.73	.73
G	.91	.11	.92	.86	.76	.79	.62	.73
H	.81	.36	.74	.72	.65	.74	.43	.45
M	.91	.56	.91	.88	.71	.75	.63	.65

Note Correlations between immediate, memory and semantics matrices are reported with Pearson (r) and Spearman (r_S) coefficients.

[a] $N = 64$. [b] $N = 28$.

Norman and Goldberg (1966) Construct validity of structure

- Comparison of interrater agreement as rater-ratee interaction increases
- Levels of interaction
  - Unknown (empty chair- Monte Carlo simulation)
  - Minimal acquaintance (Passini and Norman)
  - ROTC members
  - Fraternity juniors and Seniors
  - Peace Corp Trainees
- Structures remain the same across groups, but interrater agreement increases



FIG. 1. r_s and r_i for average of all 20 scales. P and N = Passini and Norman data, PCT = Peace Corps trainee data, FRSR = fraternity senior data.



FIG. 2. r_i for averaged subsets of factor-marker scales. P and N = Passini and Norman data, PCT = Peace Corps trainee data, FRSR = fraternity senior data.

Self and Peer ratings

- Observability of traits
  - Some traits more open to others
    - Extraversion
    - Agreeableness
    - Openness
  - Some less open
    - Emotional stability
    - Conscientiousness

Additional construct validity studies

- If traits have basis in behavior of targets, not in the eye of the beholder, then they should show trans-situational consistency
- Consistency over long period of time
- Consistency across situations
- Consistency across degree of genetic relationship

Personality constancy, consistency and coherence

- We do not expect behavior to be constant across situations
- We do expect some consistency
- More complicated is the issue of coherency

Personality Stability, Consistency, and Coherency

Personality Stability, Consistency, and Coherency

Personality Stability, Consistency, and Coherency

Estimating the Genetics of Personality



A = additive genetic variance
C = Common family environment
E = Unique environment

r_g = 1 for MZ, .5 for DZ, sibs

r_c = 1 for together, 0 apart

Personality and Genetics

Trait	Narrow heritability	Broad heritability	Shared Environment
Extraversion	0.36	0.49	0
Neuroticism	0.28	0.39	0.09
Agreeableness	0.28	0.38	0.04
Conscientiousness	0.31	0.41	0.05
Openness	0.46	0.45	0.05
IQ	0.5	0.75	0.04

McGue and Bouchard, ARN, 1998

Personality and Genetics

Occupational interest	Narrow heritability	Broad heritability[a]	Shared Environment
Realistic	0.36	0.41	0.12
Investigative	0.36	0.66	0.1
Artistic	0.39	0.5	0.12
Social	0.38	0.52	0.08
Enterprising	0.31	0.5	0.11
Conventional	0.38	0.38	0.11

[a] estimated from MZ apart correlation

McGue and Bouchard, ARN, 1998

Personality and Genetics

Psychiatric illness	Broad heritability	Shared Environment
Schizophrenia	0.8	No
Major Depression	0.37	No
Panic disorder	.30-.40	No
Generalized Anx	0.3	Small, females
Phobias	.2-.4	No
Alcoholism	.50-.60	Yes

Personality and Genetics

Social Attitudes	Broad heritability	Shared Environment
Conservatism		
Under age 20	0	Yes
Over age 20	.45-.65	Yes, females
Right Wing Auth	.50-.64	.0-.16
Religiousness (adult)	.30-.45	.2-.4
Specific religion	0	NA

Heritability: misconceptions

- High heritability => Constancy: but
  - Heritability changes by changing the environment
  - Reducing environmental variation increases the heritability
    - Herrnstein's paradox: higher heritabilities imply more equal environments
    - Low heritability => high environmental inequality

Scotland Longitudinal Study

- Test retest (age 11 to age 77) r = .63, corrected for range restriction = .73
- Mean scores on Moray House Test increased from age 11 to age 77 (43 to 54, sd = 11).
- IQ at age 11 predicted relative risk of dying before 80

Intelligence and Mortality



Descriptive vs. Causal Structure

- Descriptive: the Big 5
- Integration of causal theories of
  - Affect
  - Cognition
  - Desires/Goals
  - Behavior

Causal Models

- Biological models of approach/avoidance
  - Eysenck
    - Description and explanation
    - Arousal Theory
  - Gray
    - Reinforcement sensitivity theory
- Cognitive models of approach/avoidance
  - Atkinson, Raynor, Kuhl, etc.
  - Elliot, etc.