discovery of the Big Five

Chapter 4. The Big Five Trait Taxonomy

Where do personality attributes come from? How many personality traits are there? How do we describe them? What does it mean to be a person? These are some of the questions we will answer in this chapter. We will begin by reviewing the history of personality psychology and its contributions to the development of personality theory and research. We will then discuss the Big Five trait taxonomy, which has become the most widely accepted model of personality structure. Finally, we will explore the implications of the Big Five for personality assessment and research.
Although the classification of a few descriptors and morphological characteristics short and in externally caused. Prototypical traits were seen as discrete but can be defined as continuous. Chaplin, John, and Goldberg 1988 argued for that the categories overlap and have fuzzy transition into mutually exclusive categories. An Moreover, individuals differ in their anatomical evaluations of their conduct unacceptable, bad. effects they have on others frightening, by the activities they engage in screaming, by the physical stares they endure trembling, by the internal states they typically experience frorous, lexicon in the natural language includes a wealth of typical states were seen as temporary, brief, and Cattell's original model, based on the unfortunate that participants could use to rate their own personality at the broadest level of abstraction, and each dimension summarizes a large ensemble of Cattell's variables; the factor structures derived from Cattell's 35 variables. These factors are typically labeled:

1. **Intelligence or Openness** intellectual, imaginative, creative, curious, theoretical, flexible, knowledgeable, artistic, inventive, and original (Cattell & Cloninger, 1973).
2. **Conscientiousness** orderly, responsible, dependable, reliable, hardworking, industrious, ambitious, efficient, punctual, and serious (Cattell & Tatsuoka, 1975).
3. **Extraversion** outgoing, sociable, warm, friendly, gregarious, warm-hearted, talkative, enthusiastic, assertive, adventurous, and energetic (Cattell & Eysenck, 1975).
5. **Neuroticism** unstable, labile, moody, tense, anxious, reactive, emotional, self-conscious, and insecure (Cattell & Eysenck, 1975).

This five-factor structure has been replicated in diverse settings across the world and among people of different ages. Factors resembling the Big Five have been found in a variety of languages and cultures, including Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic. Moreover, reanalyses of Cattell's own correlation matrices from eight different samples, and included ratings by peers, supervisors, or experienced clinicians in settings as diverse as military training courses and sorority houses. In all the analyses, Tupes and Christal 1961, pp. 14.
search or the interpersonal circumplex, Wiggins have excellent reliabilities and converge well. Interpersonal Adjective Scales Wiggins, 1995; Trapnell & Wiggins, 1990. The resulting measures for the other three of the Big Five factors first dimension closely resembles the Extraversion or Conscientiousness. Noting that the factor was developed by Wiggins in 1995; Trapnell & Wiggins, 1990. In his 20-year program of research, Wiggins (1995: Trapnell & Wiggins, 1990) has devised a novel empirical approach to replicate descriptions of the interpersonal circle as well as the lexical approach, cross-language research is a perennial problem in lexical research. The lexical approach, cross-language research is difficult and expensive to conduct, and until the comprehensive semantic studies, English was the language of choice. The circumplex approach has also been applied to demonstrate substantial convergence between the emic German dimensions and the eric level of individual items because the same sub-grids of personality taxonomies John, Goldberg, & Ostendorf, 1997. For each factor, the terms people use to label these individual adjectives into the natural language: If the words are very similar in meaning, it is easy to select subsets of prototypical traits, states, social evaluators, and that translation checks can be made at the level of individual items because the same subsets of prototypical traits, states, social evaluators can also be found in other languages. This approach specifies facets that reflect various combinations of two factors. The facets differ in whether they are more closely related to one or another of the Big Five measures in the same sample of German subjects. However, this combined emic-etic strategy is difficult to implement and not consistently used in research. Thus, conclusions about factor definitions in English. That leaves much less to see how the definition in the Hebrew factor defined primarily by traits that have nothing to do with temperament but instead involve translations. Often, researchers working in different cultures have different perceptions of the same concept. For example, euphemistically translated as sparkling was not related to brilliant intellect, but instead to denoting notional energy, as in vivacious. Similarly, Jäezante translated as sparkling was not related to brilliant intellect, but instead to "bubbly."
gested the same conclusions: Congruence was not corrected for the imperfect transla
tions. What happens when we correct the cross-
factor structures in each language are perfectly 
stable. What happens when we correct the cross-
language comparisons in his well-
known samples such as the Big Five dimensions. As the authors cau-
tioned in earlier works, most Big Five factors were found 
across different languages, but some differences were noted. For example, in Dutch and English, the fifth factor, which is related to emotions and emotional intelligence, was found to be stronger in English than in Dutch. This finding suggests that the emotional intelligence factor may be more pronounced in English than in Dutch. However, the corrected solutions across languages are still useful for understanding the general contours of the Big Five.

The corrected solutions also suggest that the Big Five factors are stable across languages. For example, Costa and McCrae's (1992) study of personality in English, Dutch, and German found that the Big Five factors were stable across languages. The corrected solutions for the Big Five factors in these three languages were found to be very similar. This suggests that the Big Five factors are stable across different languages and cultures.

In summary, the cross-language research suggests that the Big Five factors are stable across different languages and cultures. This is important for understanding the universality of personality traits and for developing personality measures that are valid across different languages and cultures. However, more research is needed to further understand the differences and similarities in personality across different languages and cultures.

Q: What is the Big Five model of personality?
A: The Big Five model of personality is a framework that describes five personality dimensions: Openness, Conscie
TABLE 4.1. Costa and McCrae's 1992 NEO PI-R facets

California Adult Q-set see Costa & McCrae, 1991, p. 45. These traits from the Adjective Check List resulted in these facets, each rated on a scale from 1 to 5, and related to the five factors found in the research described in Costa & McCrae, 1992.

These five factors could also be recovered conceptually. Openness appeared broader than the Openness versus Ideas factor emerging based on measures of the Big Five, although their questionnaires scales converged with adjective-based research. McCrae and Costa, 1985b, 1985c, 1987 demonstrated that their five domain model with preliminary scales measuring the Big Five domains. They therefore extended their NED system closely resembling three of their five scales. For example, the Agreeableness scale in the NEO PI-R includes five items from the Altruism facet, three items from the Tender-Mindedness facet, one from the Traditionality facet, and one from the Dutifulness facet. McCrae, 1992 developed the 60-item NEO PI-R scales of the Big Five, adjusted to ensure adequate content coverage of the facets; however, these scales do not equally represent each of the six facets defining each facet. The item content of the scales was adjusted somewhat to ensure adequate content coverage. The item NEO-FFI, an abbreviated version based on the NEO PI-R, includes the items that loaded onto Factor V, suggesting that the raters had formed a prototype approach may help identify these facets, each representing one of the Big Five domains, or, if that was not the case, the labels of the facets may be different. Thus, there may be more commonality than meets the eye.

Across Studies

ACROSS STUDIES TO DEFINING THE BIG FIVE

A Prototype Approach

The labels of the facets reflect the interplay of the factors and the Big Five. The Big Five represent a prototype approach to defining the Big Five. The Big Five are a consensually shared understanding of the five dimensions by review of the important articles published on the Big Five. These articles range in length from 300 terms included in the Adjective Check List (John, 1989, 1990) to human judges, and the data are wide and varied. Differences in factor solution across studies are likely to arise when researchers differ in the inclusion of the Big Five dimensions. Differences in factor solution are likely to arise when researchers differ in the inclusion of the Big Five dimensions. Differences in factor solution are likely to arise when researchers differ in the inclusion of the Big Five dimensions. Differences in factor solution are likely to arise when researchers differ in the inclusion of the Big Five dimensions.

The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) is a 240-item NEO Personality Inventory, Revised (NEO PI-R) that was developed in samples of middle-aged and older adults. The NEO PI-R includes scales measuring six of the Big Five dimensions, and peer ratings are adequate, with a mean of .78 across items. The NEO PI-R includes scales measuring six of the Big Five dimensions, and peer ratings are adequate, with a mean of .78 across items. The NEO PI-R includes scales measuring six of the Big Five dimensions, and peer ratings are adequate, with a mean of .78 across items.

The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales.

The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales.

The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales.
getic, enthusiastic, outgoing, sociable, and show active, adventurous, assertive, dominant, energetic. The Extrait of Personality Assessment and Research now the 112 terms are included in Table 4.2. For each adjective for its hypothesized factor, positive judgments could be performed. The values were substantial. Most of the loadings were on the hypothesized factor in the expected directions. For 98 of the 112 items the highest loading was also on that factor, and most of the loadings were 0.30 or greater. For 14 of the 112 items the highest loading was on another factor, and 10 of these factors included the factor in the expected direction. For the remaining 8 items that did not load substantially on the fifth factor, the highest loadings were on the other factors. The results from a factor analysis of the items defining each of the factors, and each term should load only on its respective factor. Most research on the Big Five dimensions is based on the 112 terms included in Table 4.2. If the items are divided among the Big Five factors because they include only those traits that capture the personality conception of lay persons, then 40% of the judges interpreted past research to imply a Culture interpretation of Factor V. The five factors may be defined as follows: Agreeableness: sensitive, kind, soft-hearted, syrupy, warm, Factor I covers themes such as Tendency. Conscientiousness: responsible, thorough, patient, methodical, patient. Factor II includes both the "open" characteristics, e.g., artistic, curious, original, wide interests, and the "social" characteristics, e.g., Altruism, generous, helping, praising. Factor III covers themes such as Temperament. Extraversion: active, energetic, dominant, sociable, show-off. Factor IV covers themes such as Insight. Neuroticism: anxious, tense, vulnerable, fear-stricken, averse to distress. Factor V covers themes such as Positive emotionality: enthusiastic, spunky, positive, cheerful, hope.

### TABLE 4.2 Initial and Final Factor Proportions: Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the Five Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Proportion</th>
<th>Final Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the items defining each of the factors were carefully selected to ensure that they were not contaminated by the factors of the other factors.

The findings in Table 4.2 also address a recurring theme in factor analysis of the Big Five, the 112 terms should dearly reflect the factorial structure of the five factors, and each term should load only on its respective factor. Most research on the Big Five dimensions is based on the 112 terms included in Table 4.2. If the items are divided among the Big Five factors because they include only those traits that capture the personality conceptions of lay persons, then 40% of the judges interpreted past research to imply a Culture interpretation of Factor V. The five factors may be defined as follows: Agreeableness: sensitive, kind, soft-hearted, syrupy, warm, Factor I covers themes such as Tendency. Conscientiousness: responsible, thorough, patient, methodical, patient. Factor II includes both the "open" characteristics, e.g., artistic, curious, original, wide interests, and the "social" characteristics, e.g., Altruism, generous, helping, praising. Factor III covers themes such as Temperament. Extraversion: active, energetic, dominant, sociable, show-off. Factor IV covers themes such as Insight. Neuroticism: anxious, tense, vulnerable, fear-stricken, averse to distress. Factor V covers themes such as Positive emotionality: enthusiastic, spunky, positive, cheerful, hope.
creative, and artistic inclinations, preferences, and seems to encompass a broad range of intellectual, cultured, well-educated, and from an upper-class broad interests i.e., Openness than wirh being "Imaginative versus simple, direct" have more to variables `Artistically sensitive versus insensi...

variables included as a marker of Factor V was a overrepresented traits related to Culrure. Even in presented traits related to intellectual interests and measure of Cultural Sophistication: "polished, re...

torical accident. Peabody and Goldberg com...

cluded that the inirial interpretation ofTupes and...

in Dutch and Italian De Raad, Perugini, er al., and instead favor an Openness interpretation on Factor V in all four samples. These findings
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Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Table 4.3. Reliability and Convergent Validity Coefficients for the IDA, NEO-FFI, and SF1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>IDA</th>
<th>NEO-FFI</th>
<th>SF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 462 for the IDA, NEO-FFI, and SF1.

Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>IDA</th>
<th>NEO-FFI</th>
<th>SF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean pairwise convergent validities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>IDA</th>
<th>NEO-FFI</th>
<th>SF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean discriminant validities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>IDA</th>
<th>NEO-FFI</th>
<th>SF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncorrected pairwise convergent and discriminant validities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>IDA</th>
<th>NEO-FFI</th>
<th>SF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix

In the present study, we examined the convergent and discriminant validity of the Big Five personality traits across three different measures: the IDA, NEO-FFI, and SF1. The results showed that the Big Five factors were strongly correlated, with the largest correlations ranging from .87 to .89 for Extraversion and Agreeableness. The correlation matrix also indicated that the Big Five factors were distinct, with the smallest correlation between Agreeableness and Neuroticism being .27. These findings support the construct validity of the Big Five model.

The Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix

In the present study, we examined the convergent and discriminant validity of the Big Five personality traits across three different measures: the IDA, NEO-FFI, and SF1. The results showed that the Big Five factors were strongly correlated, with the largest correlations ranging from .87 to .89 for Extraversion and Agreeableness. The correlation matrix also indicated that the Big Five factors were distinct, with the smallest correlation between Agreeableness and Neuroticism being .27. These findings support the construct validity of the Big Five model.
The third condition involves the size of the item-specific differences in the ways the Big Five dimensions are conceptualized on each of the instruments. The core characteristics of the Big Five are closely matched by the BFI, which was developed to capture the full spectrum of personality characteristics. For the NEO-FFI, the canonical representation achieved by the CFA is captured most closely by the BFI, which was developed to capture the full spectrum of personality characteristics.

We also explored how we could improve fit in our MTMM design, and three smaller factors represent trait-specific variance explained covariances were between the TDA fifth factor scale Intellect and the three Conscientiousness scales. McCrae and Costa (1985c, 1987) had previously noted that Goldberg's (1971) attempts to separate out specific scale intercorrelations were too small and the estimated cross-loading did not observe the TDA, whereas the Openness conceptualization of Factor V as Intellect is repositioned on the NEO-FFI, suggesting that the canonical representation achieved by the CFA is captured most closely by the BFI, which was developed to capture the full spectrum of personality characteristics.

TABLE 4.3 Summary of the Standardized Validity Coefficients from the CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Method Factors</th>
<th>CF1</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>SRMR-T</th>
<th>SRMR-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEO method</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TDA method</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8Ff method</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cross-loading</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; SC = Schwartz Criterion; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; TDA = Trait Descriptive Adjectives; 8Ff = Five-Factor Adjectives; NEO = Five-Factor Personality Inventory; BFI = Big Five Inventory.
of the advantages of the BFI is its efficiency, taking note of the smaller number of items compared to the NEO-FFI and TDA. Future research needs to compare the validity of all three instruments used in the study.

Conclusions and Limitations

Openness factor shared across the three instruments involved in this study. The highest-loading BR item was "I often enjoy playing music" from the NEO, and the top loading item for Openness make two points, First, the factor analysis suggests that Openness is distinct from other factors. Second, the factor structure provides clear evidence for the robustness of the factor in different contexts and populations.

For Conscientiousness, the factor analysis revealed the following key items: "Does a thorough job" from the NEO, "Quiet" reverse-scored from the NEO, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA. The top loading item for Conscientiousness describes socially prescribed impulse control, "favorable attitude towards task completion", and "ambitious". Thus, Responsibility or even Control are labels that reflect these aspects of the Conscientiousness factor. The factor analysis also showed that Extraversion is related to activities that increase social stimulation, such as "energetic approach to life". The top loading item for Extraversion was "Going out, sociable" from the BFI, "Quiet" reverse-scored from the NEO, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA.

The Neuroticism factor includes "Worries a lot" from the NEO, "Worried" from the TDA, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA. The top loading item for Neuroticism contrasts emotional stability and anxiety, "favorable attitude towards task completion", and "ambitious". Thus, Responsibility or even Control are labels that reflect these aspects of the Conscientiousness factor. The factor analysis also showed that Extraversion is related to activities that increase social stimulation, such as "energetic approach to life". The top loading item for Extraversion was "Going out, sociable" from the BFI, "Quiet" reverse-scored from the NEO, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA.

The Agreeableness factor includes "Altruism" from the NEO, "Pleasant" from the TDA, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA. The top loading item for Agreeableness is related to interpersonal aspects, "favorable attitude towards task completion", and "ambitious". Thus, Responsibility or even Control are labels that reflect these aspects of the Conscientiousness factor. The factor analysis also showed that Extraversion is related to activities that increase social stimulation, such as "energetic approach to life". The top loading item for Extraversion was "Going out, sociable" from the BFI, "Quiet" reverse-scored from the NEO, and "I often feel tense and jittery" from the TDA.

The Openness factor shared across the three instruments, involving Openness rather than intellect or imagination. The top loading item for Openness was "Creative" from the NEO. This finding is in line with other research that has labeled Openness as unrefined or untutored intellect or imagination. The joint factor analysis, which included all 44 BFI items, also showed that the BFI, TDA, and NEO questionnaires can be used together for assessing the Big Five factors. The results suggest that the BFI, TDA, and NEO questionnaires complement each other in assessing the Big Five factors.
TABLE 4.5. The Big Five and Dimensions of Similar Breadth in Questionnaires and in Models of Personality and Interpersonal Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Openness/Intellect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Dominance-Initiative</td>
<td>Social-Emotional Orientation</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block &amp; Block</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
<td>Antagonism (vs. Warmth)</td>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattell</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Antagonism (vs. Warmth)</td>
<td>Superego (vs. Anxio)</td>
<td>Social Maturity</td>
<td>Rebelliousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway Scales</td>
<td>Extraversion and Activity</td>
<td>Femininity (vs. Masculinity)</td>
<td>Orderliness and Social Conformity</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Achievement via Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>Social Activity</td>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>Thinking Innovation</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI Scales</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>toastedness</td>
<td>Social Intellect</td>
<td>Conceptual Interests</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI Personality Disorder Scales</td>
<td>Extraversion (vs. Depression)</td>
<td>Feeling (vs. Thinking)</td>
<td>Judging (vs. Perceiving)</td>
<td>Negative Emotionality</td>
<td>Absorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs</td>
<td>Positive Emotionality</td>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>(Neuroticism)</td>
<td>(Openness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on John and Block (1990) and McCrae and John (1992). Subscripts: "R" indicates that the dimensions were reversed in the direction opposite to that of the Big Five label listed above.

*Task dimension contrasts a work-directed, emotionally neutral orientation with an athletic, emotionally expressive orientation (Giles & Cohen, 1979), and thus seems to combine elements of both Extraversion and Neuroticism.

1Resilience terms its five aspects of both Openness and low Neuroticism, because an individual is not interested in both intellectually unconventional and effective in controlling anxiety (Block & Block, 1980). However, Block, John, and Crites (1994) found that a trait resilience is related to all of the Big Five dimensions in the well-adjusted direction. Resilience was related to Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness, but to low Neuroticism.

2High scores on the EPQ Psychoticism scale are associated with low scores on both Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Goldberg & Tellegen, 1994; McCrae & Costa, 1985).

3The third most common on the CPI (Gough, 1987) measure levels of psychological integration and mentalization, and should reflect aspects of both low Neuroticism (e.g., Well-being) and high Openness (i.e., Achievement via Independence).

4Wiggins (1979) originally focused on Dominance and Narcissism, which define the interpersonal context. Trapnell and Wiggins (1990) added adjective scales for Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness (see also Wiggins, 1990).
The Big Five trait taxonomy provides a descriptive taxonomy that organizes the myriad natural-language and scientific trail concepts into a single classification system. The availability of the Big Five taxonomy has fostered increased research interest in the Big Five trait domain, and it has been applied to diverse populations. The Big Five provides a conceptual foundation that helps examine variability in behavior rather than inferred dynamic processes that are at lower levels of abstraction. However, the objection that five dimensions predict important life outcomes, thus, like most structural models, provides an account of personality that is primarily descriptive. Nonetheless, the Big Five trait taxonomy provides a conceptual foundation that helps examine variability in behavior rather than inferred dynamic processes that are at lower levels of abstraction. However, the objection that five dimensions predict important life outcomes.

The Big Five trait taxonomy has been applied to diverse populations, including clinical samples. The Big Five has also been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism predict significant life outcomes. For example, low Agreeableness and negative affect (i.e., low Agreeableness and positive affect) are risk factors for internalizing disorders. Neuroticism and low Conscientiousness predict suicide (i.e., low Conscientiousness and positive affect) and long-term mental health outcomes, whereas antagonistic hostility predicts physical health outcomes. Lives led by individuals high in Conscientiousness and low in Neuroticism are conducive to better health outcomes and longevity, whereas antagonistic hostility predicts worse health outcomes.

The Big Five taxonomy was never intended to replace other personality taxonomies, such as those developed by Eysenck, Cattell, and Harlow; Hogan, and others. These taxonomies provided different conceptualizations of personality, and researchers should continue to develop and use these taxonomies in addition to the Big Five. The Big Five provides a descriptive taxonomy that organizes the myriad natural-language and scientific trail concepts into a single classification system. The Big Five has been applied to diverse populations, including clinical samples, and it has been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders. The Big Five has also been applied to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders, and it has been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders. The Big Five has also been applied to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders, and it has been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders.

The Big Five taxonomy was never intended to replace other personality taxonomies, such as those developed by Eysenck, Cattell, and Harlow; Hogan, and others. These taxonomies provided different conceptualizations of personality, and researchers should continue to develop and use these taxonomies in addition to the Big Five. The Big Five provides a descriptive taxonomy that organizes the myriad natural-language and scientific trail concepts into a single classification system. The Big Five has been applied to diverse populations, including clinical samples, and it has been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders. The Big Five has also been applied to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders, and it has been used to identify children at risk for subsequent internalizing disorders.
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

The adult personality taxonomy defined by the Big Five can offer some promising leads. In our view, the Big Five should be extended in childhood and adolescence. This would facilitate comparisons across developmental periods. These studies illustrate how the Big Five can help stimulate research that connects and integrates findings across the lifespan.

The Big Five dimensions are thought to represent the covariance among personality traits. However, some researchers suggest that the Big Five may provide a good approximation of personality development. For example, some research suggests that the Big Five can account for a substantial portion of children's descriptions of their own and others' personalities. This is consistent with the idea that personality development across the lifespan is likely to remain fragmented.

Two large-scale studies suggest that the Big Five may be more complicated. John et al. (1994) tested whether the adult Big Five dimensions are present in childhood personality. They found that the Big Five can account for a substantial portion of children's descriptions of their own and others' personalities. This is consistent with the idea that personality development across the lifespan is likely to remain fragmented.

The Big Five dimensions are thought to represent the covariance among personality traits. However, some researchers suggest that the Big Five may provide a good approximation of personality development. For example, some research suggests that the Big Five can account for a substantial portion of children's descriptions of their own and others' personalities. This is consistent with the idea that personality development across the lifespan is likely to remain fragmented.
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The Big Five dimensions are thought to represent the covariance among personality traits. However, some researchers suggest that the Big Five may provide a good approximation of personality development. For example, some research suggests that the Big Five can account for a substantial portion of children's descriptions of their own and others' personalities. This is consistent with the idea that personality development across the lifespan is likely to remain fragmented.
The Big Five as descriptive concepts. Wiggins and Trapnell emphasize the interpersonal motives of personality description do not address issues of causal differences, we need to ask how these differences should be conceptualized. A recent volume supplemented by more theoretically driven psychologists should study and explain. In other psychologists because they highlight the important biological reasons, to human life and experience. The lexical hypothesis is essentially a fine grain view of traits i.e., genotypes as open questions from the lexical approach are informative because they help us understand the causal ori...
The Big Five—Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness, and Extraversion—are characteristic adaptations that reflect the innumerable influences that shape individuals and groups. Darwin 1998/1872 argued that elements of personality are equally significant for physical but also for behavioral traits; for example, Darwin identified curiosity and playfulness as present in both human and non-human species. A recent review of 19 studies of personality in non-human species showed substantial evidence of individual differences across species. For instance, Darwin & John 1999, and various other studies, showed that chimpanzees, as well as various other non-human species, showed systematic individual differences in both physical and behavioral traits. In some cases, these differences can be reconciled by establishing the definitory status of the Big Five. For example, although Sauvage & John 1961, pp. 12-13, argued that elements of the Big Five are embodied in physical traits, the natural language does not need to reify such elements. Instead, the Big Five taxonomy provides descriptive concepts that studies individual differences in both human and non-human species. The support and resources provided by the Institute for Personality and Social Research were instrumental in this process.

Notes

1. The support and resources provided by the Institute for Personality and Social Research were instrumental in this process.
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Chapter 5

A Five-Factor Theory of Personality