

Stability of Personality Traits over Time: The case of Rural India

Arnaud Natal^{*} & Christophe J. Nordman[†]

Very preliminary draft

August 25, 2021

Abstract

L'internal consistency est excellente pour 2016-17 et moyenne pour 2020-21. Cependant, à vérifier en lancant de nouveau les lignes

Cependant, lorsqu'on lance une analyse factorielle pour 2016-17 et une pour 2020-21, on voit que les mêmes facteurs ressortent à peu près et ils sont relativement proche du Big-5, suggérant que ca fonctionne bien

Keywords: Gender, caste, panel data, Tamil Nadu.

JEL Codes:

^{*}Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, GREThA, UMR 5113, F-33600 PESSAC, FRANCE - arnaud.natal@u-bordeaux.fr

[†]IRD, UMR LEDa-DIAL, IFP - nordman@dial.prd

1 Introduction

- Faire analyse factorielle 2016
- Faire analyse factorielle 2020
- Faire FA par sexe, caste et age
- Organiser le papier
- Selon moi, si l'objectif c'est de regarder la stabilité, il faut partir de la mesure du Big-5
- Puis balancer les omega pour montrer la cohérence interne: si élevée alors ca veut dire que le Big-5 est pas dég
- Aborder la question du biais avec les mesures
- Montrer que le modèle n'est pas forcément dégueu en 2016 car FA similaire à Big5
- Pb pour 2020, la FA ne colle pas

Since more than a decade, there has been increasing interest in psychology in economics literature, especially through personality traits and cognitive skills (PT&CS). The relevance of such analysis in economics is well documented. [Hanushek and Woessmann \(2008\)](#) show that cognitive skills are correlated with individual earnings, distribution of income and economic growth (and other factors such as well-functioning economic institutions –although enter into growth and may well have stronger effects, may also amplify the effects of cognitive skills). Regarding personality traits, [Borghans, Duckworth, Heckman, and ter Weel \(2008\)](#) examine, for instance, the relevance of this in economics. They show that psychological variables are a good predictor of socioeconomic success and especially on the labour market¹. Institutions, such as World Bank, collect more and more data² on PT&CS because it enables a better understanding of skill requirements in the labour market, backward linkages between skills acquisitions and educational achievement, personality, and social background, and forward linkages

¹For further details see [Almlund, Duckworth, Heckman, and Kautz \(2011\)](#).

²As stated by [Laajaj and Macours \(2019\)](#), the World Bank alone spent 1 billion USD a year for data on PT&CS.

between skills acquisitions and living standards, reductions in inequality and poverty, social inclusion, and economic growth (Valerio, Sanchez Puerta, Pierre, Rajadel, & Monroy Taborda, 2014).

Definition Used in similar studies, personality traits and cognitive skills measure two distinct skills. Cognitive skills represent the mental processes involved in the acquisition of knowledge, manipulation of information, and reasoning that include the domains of perception, memory, learning, attention, decision-making, and language abilities (Kiely, 2014) while personality is the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought (Allport, 1961). The Big-5 model constitutes the main personality trait taxonomy³. It identifies five dimensions of personality: emotional stability –ES– (capacity to experience negative emotions); extraversion –EX– (capacity to experience positive emotions, the tendency to seek stimulation and company from others); openness to experience –OP– (capacity to be creative and unstructured); agreeableness –AG– (perceptions of others that are caring, compassionate, and altruistic); conscientiousness –CO– (capacity to display self-discipline, act dutifully, and strive for achievement against measures or outside expectations).

Exogeneity of personality traits and cognitive skills The exogeneity of PT&CS is well assumed because of stability over time while there is no consensus in psychology (Ardelt, 2000; Deary, 2014).

For personality traits, according to Costa and McCrae (1997); McCrae et al. (2000) it remains stable, in part, because it is a genetic predisposition that, by definition, cannot be changed over life. Many economists follow this path and the majority of them assume stability over time after the age of 25 (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012) and others verify this stability (Cobb-Clark & Tan, 2011). However, the stability refutes sociological and psychological literature which interesting in the influence of childhood and adulthood socialisation on personality (Moen, Elder Jr., & Lüscher, 1995; Mortimer & Simmons, 1978). Ardel (2000) state that “personality can change over the course of a person’s life, particularly if age at first measurement is low or over 50, if the retest interval is large, if

³Among the theories of personality, the traits can be defined as thought, emotion and habitual patterns of behaviour (Kassin, 2003).

individual personality aspects rather than the overall personality are considered [...].” However, analysis of stability do not provide sufficient information on change in the social environment and Ardet (2000) suggests to analyse personality before and after “unexpected, drastic changes in people’s social environments”. Indeed, such changes can imply a change in the individual personality to adapt to the new environment that they did not select.

Big-5 taxonomy not universal Gurven, von Rueden, Massenkoff, Kaplan, and Vie (2013)

2 Data

Our empirical analysis is based on NEEMESIS-1 & NEEMESIS-2 (Networks, Employment, dEbt, Mobilities and Skills in India Survey) surveys carried out respectively in 2016-17, and 2020-21 ([Nordman, Guérin, Michiels, Natal, & Venkatasubramanian, 2019](#); [Nordman et al., 2017](#)). These surveys are the second and third waves of a longitudinal data collection project⁴ start in 2010 with RUME (RUral Microfinance and Employment survey) project in ten villages of Tamil Nadu. Located in the Cuddalore and Villupuram districts, a mostly agricultural area, economies benefits from the proximity of two large industrial towns (Neyveli and Cuddalore) and a regional business center (Panruti).

RUME randomly selected 405 households using stratified sample framework based on three dimensions: proximity to small towns (Panruti, Villupuram and Cuddalore), an agro-ecological criterion, and caste affiliation. Thus, half of villages have irrigated land (the other half is dry) and within villages, half of the sample was selected from the mostly upper and middle caste part of the village (Ur) while the other half from the Colony part, where dalits (the ex-untouchables) mainly live. NEEMESIS-1 recovered 388 households (4.19% attrition rate) and randomly selected 104 news households (for a total of 492 households) from these 10 villages, based on the same method. NEEMESIS-2 recovered 485 households (1.42% attrition rate) from 2016-17 and recovered 10 households from 2010 that were not recovered in 2016-17. Moreover, 100 news households were randomly selected (for a total of 595 households).

In NEEMESIS-1 & NEEMESIS-2, two household members, called “ego 1” (mostly household questionnaire respondent) and “ego 2” (one younger household member randomly selected on a criterion of age), are directly addressed individual questionnaires that provide for instance a range of information on PT&CS.

Regarding the reliability, the great expertise of the team⁵ helped to formulate questions appropriately. Moreover, the moderate magnitude of the survey, compared to nationally representative datasets, ensures the high quality of the data and the tablet-based mode of data collection improved data quality in including constraints on

⁴Project took place within two broader research programmes located within the Observatory of Rural Dynamics and Inequalities (<https://odriis.hypotheses.org/>) at the French Institute of Pondicherry, India.

⁵Some members of the research team are present since more than 20 years on the region for numerous quantitative and qualitative surveys.

answers to prevent inconsistencies.

3 Methodology

3.1 Construction of personality traits & cognitive skills variables

As stated earlier, our survey allows us to construct measures of cognitive skills. It includes three score variables based on literacy test, numeracy test and Raven progressive matrices test⁶. These scores are constructed in adding up the correct answers of a set of four questions for literacy and numeracy test (six for numeracy in 2020-21) and 36 for Raven. Then, we standardise the score to ensure comparability of results between personality traits and cognitive skills.

Regarding personality traits, on the basis of 35 questions referring to Big-5 taxonomy, we averaged answers –based on a Likert scale from 1–“Almost Never” to 5–“Almost always”, that belong to a determined trait after correcting for acquiescence bias⁷ (see Appendix A). The resulting mean represents the score on each trait.

3.2 Factor analysis

As warned by Laajaj et al. (2019), the Big-5 taxonomy is limited in developing countries for several reasons: the enumerator-respondent interactions in face-to-face survey can induce a bias; the low education levels can make questions more difficult to understand and can induce a systematic response patterns, especially the acquiescence bias. The very good knowledge of the field (see section ??) allow us to collect data of high quality and avoid a bias due to misunderstanding of questions. Moreover, we implement our own factor analysis of the 35 questions by principal component with promax rotation. To avoid a bias in factor analysis, we do not recode reverse questions because it might force likeness with Big-5 taxonomy. In our dataset, acquiescence bias is measure with a set of reverse questions that are supposed perfectly opposed to another set of questions. However, the assumption of opposition is supportable only in the Big-5 taxonomy. In

⁶Raven matrix is “a nonverbal test of mental ability consisting of abstract designs, each of which is missing one part. The participant chooses the missing component from several alternatives to complete each design.” – <https://dictionary.apa.org/ravens-progressive-matrices>. Accessed January 27, 2021.

⁷Acquiescence bias represents the tendency to answer more in one direction (agree or disagree) over the other.

another layout, pairs of questions can measure different aspects of personality⁸. The resulting factors for 2016-17 data are relatively similar to the Big-5 personality traits with satisfactory McDonald's Ω : Factor 1 as Openness-Extraversion ($\Omega = 0.91$); Factor 2 as Conscientiousness ($\Omega = 0.88$); Factor 3 as *Porupillatavan* –Tamil terms for talkative, easily distracted individual– ($\Omega = 0.69$); Factor 4 as Emotional stability ($\Omega = 0.78$) and Factor 5 as Agreeableness ($\Omega = 0.62$) (see Appendix A) while resulting factors for 2020-21 data are very different to the Big-5 taxonomy and to the 2016-17 factors. We do not present results here because we do not use it as personality traits measure (see section ??), however it is available on request.

⁸Singh, Misra, and Raad (2013) show that in Hindi, the major language spoken in India, three traits different from Big-5 taxonomy firmly stood out.

4 Results

Our results show stability for minor part of the population (see Appendix ??). Non-corrected traits, in addition to having globally (2016-17 and 2020-21) higher internal consistency (see Table 17) are less unstable over time without being able to relate stability. Evolution of personality traits can be explained by the fact that NEEMSIS-2 data were collected after the first lockdown⁹ (end of 2020) and the associated mental health consequences (Golechha, 2020; Kochhar et al., 2020) can have cause –or at least exacerbated, the non-stability.

Concerning cognitive skills, majority of individuals have higher or equal score in 2020-21 than in 2016-17 (see Appendix ??) which is consistent with the lifelong learning theory –the continuing development of knowledge and skills that people experience after formal education and throughout their lives (London, 2011).

4.1 Acquiescence bias

I have calculated acquiescence bias (AB) for all egos of 2016-17 ($n=953$) and 2020-21 ($n=1,316$). Around 0.5, the bias is medium (not too high but not 0), from 1, the bias is too high. **Le biais se mesure en faisant la moyenne des questions inversées. Les réponses allant de 1 à 5 (1-Almost always; 2-Quite often; 3-Sometimes; 4-Rarely; 5-Almost never), la moyenne obtenue pour un individu sans biais est de 3 (Sometimes) car il est censé répondre aux deux questions (dont une inversée) : Deux fois Sometimes ou une fois Almost always et une fois Almost never ou une fois Quite often et une fois Rarely. Un biais de 0.5 correspond à la combinaison d'1 modalité moins parfaite. Par exemple Almost always et Rarely. Un biais de 1 correspond à une combinaison moins parfaite de 2 modalités. Par exemple Almost always et Sometimes. Un biais supérieur à 1 correspond à une combinaison moins parfaite de 3 ou 4 modalités.**

Figure 13 shows the distribution of the acquiescence bias in 2016-17 and in 2020-21. Even if a small part of our population have a high AB, the 2020-21 distribution is more spread out to the right in 2020-21 than in 2016-17, suggesting higher bias. Intuition is confirmed with Figure 14 that shows cumulative distribution of acquiescence bias. The

⁹See <https://thewire.in/covid-19-india-timeline> for complete timeline of COVID-19 pandemic in India. Accessed August 16, 2021.

flatter the curve is, the lower the acquiescence bias is. In 2016-17, 50% of individuals have a bias lower than 0.3 while it is 0.5 in 2020-21.

Figure 15 shows that female have higher bias than male. In 2020-21, by caste,

4.2 Internal consistency

McDonald's Ω^{10} , a measure of internal consistency, are mostly satisfactory for 2016-17 data corrected from acquiescence bias: 0.81 for openness; 0.86 for conscientiousness; 0.59 for extraversion; 0.60 for agreeableness and 0.80 for emotional stability (see Figure 17). For 2020-21, the internal validity after correcting for acquiescence bias is not ideal compared to non-corrected items. It implies that results could suffer from measurement error, which would bias our results towards zero.

4.3 Factor analysis

2016-17

1. OP-EX
2. CO
3. *Porupillatavan*
4. ES
5. AG


2020-21

1. Mix
2. CO
3. ES
4. Mix
5. Mix

¹⁰Literature on internal consistency estimators increasingly agrees that Cronbach's α –the widest used estimator is maybe not very efficient (Bourque, Doucet, LeBlanc, Dupuis, & Nadeau, 2019; Trizano-Hermosilla & Alvarado, 2016).

Donc CO et ES ressortent avec l'analyse factorielle donc on peut regarder la stabilité ici avec ça je pense.


5 Corrected items



Traits corrected from acquiescence bias.

Figure 1

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.



Traits corrected from acquiescence bias.

Figure 2

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 3

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 4

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.

6 Non-corrected items




Figure 5

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.





Figure 6


Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.



Raw traits (non-corrected from acquiescence bias).

Figure 7

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Raw traits (non-corrected from acquiescence bias).

Figure 8

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.

7 Factor analysis



without Grit.

Figure 9

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 10

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 11
Source: NEEMSS-1 (2016-17); author's calculations.




Figure 12
Source: NEEMSS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations

References

- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Almlund, M., Duckworth, A. L., Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. D. (2011). Personality Psychology and Economics. In E. Hanushek, S. Machin, & L. Woessman (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–181). Amsterdam: Elsevier. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53444-6.00001-8> doi: 10.1016/B978-0-444-53444-6.00001-8
- Ardelt, M. (2000, dec). Still Stable after All These Years? Personality Stability Theory Revisited. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(4), 392. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695848> doi: 10.2307/2695848
- Borghans, L., Duckworth, A. L., Heckman, J. J., & ter Weel, B. (2008). The economics and psychology of personality traits. *Journal of Human Resources*, 43(4), 972–1059. doi: 10.3368/jhr.43.4.972
- Bourque, J., Doucet, D., LeBlanc, J., Dupuis, J., & Nadeau, J. (2019). Cronbach's alpha is one of the worst internal consistency estimators: a simulation study. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, 45(2), 78. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.7202/1067534ar> doi: 10.7202/1067534ar
- Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Schurer, S. (2012, apr). The stability of big-five personality traits. *Economics Letters*, 115(1), 11–15. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2011.11.015> doi: 10.1016/j.econlet.2011.11.015
- Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Tan, M. (2011, January). Noncognitive skills, occupational attainment, and relative wages. *Labour Economics*, 18(1), 1–13. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2010.07.003> doi: 10.1016/j.labeco.2010.07.003
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1997). Longitudinal Stability of Adult Personality. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnsson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 269–290). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951, sep). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555> doi: 10.1007/bf02310555
- Deary, I. J. (2014, aug). The stability of intelligence from childhood to old age. *Current*

Directions in Psychological Science, 23(4), 239–245. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414536905> doi: 10.1177/0963721414536905

Golechha, M. (2020, jun). COVID-19, india, lockdown and psychosocial challenges: What next? *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 66(8), 830–832. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020935922> doi: 10.1177/0020764020935922

Gurven, M., von Rueden, C., Massenkoff, M., Kaplan, H., & Vie, M. L. (2013, feb). How universal is the Big Five? Testing the five-factor model of personality variation among forager-farmers in the Bolivian Amazon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 354–370. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030841> doi: 10.1037/a0030841

Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2008, aug). The role of cognitive skills in economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46(3), 607–668. Retrieved from <http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/jel.46.3.607> doi: 10.1257/jel.46.3.607

Kassin, S. (2003). *Psychology*. Pearson.

Kiely, K. M. (2014). Cognitive function. In *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 974–978). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_426 doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_426

Kochhar, A. S., Bhasin, R., Kochhar, G. K., Dadlani, H., Mehta, V. V., Kaur, R., & Bhasin, C. K. (2020, dec). Lockdown of 1.3 billion people in India during Covid-19 pandemic: A survey of its impact on mental health. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 54, 102213. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102213> doi: 10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102213

Laajaj, R., & Macours, K. (2019, October). Measuring skills in developing countries. *Journal of Human Resources*, 1018–9805R1. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.56.4.1018-9805r1> doi: 10.3368/jhr.56.4.1018-9805r1

Laajaj, R., Macours, K., Hernandez, D. A. P., Arias, O., Gosling, S. D., Potter, J., ... Vakis, R. (2019, jul). Challenges to capture the big five personality traits in non-WEIRD populations. *Science Advances*, 5(7). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw5226> doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw5226

London, M. (Ed.). (2011). *The Oxford Handbook of Lifelong Learning*. Oxford University

Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195390483.001.0001

McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Hřebíčková, M., Avia, M. D., ... Smith, P. B. (2000). Nature over nurture: Temperament, personality, and life span development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(1), 173–186. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.1.173> doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.78.1.173

McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment*. New-York: Psychology Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601087> doi: 10.4324/9781410601087

Moen, P., Elder Jr., G. H., & Lüscher, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Examining Lives in Context: Perspectives on the Ecology of Human Development*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Mortimer, J. T., & Simmons, R. G. (1978, aug). Adult socialization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 4(1), 421–454. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.04.080178.002225> doi: 10.1146/annurev.so.04.080178.002225

Nordman, C. J., Guérin, I., Michiels, S., Natal, A., & Venkatasubramanian, G. (2019, December). *NEEMSIS Survey Report: A Full Statistical Picture of the Household and Individual Data* (techreport). French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP) and Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD). Retrieved from <https://neemsis.hypotheses.org/ressources/statistical-report>

Nordman, C. J., Guérin, I., Venkatasubramanian, G., Michiels, S., Lanos, Y., Kumar, S., ... Hilger, A. (2017, November). *Neemsis survey manuel* (techreport). 11, rue Saint-Louis, 605-001 Pondichéry, Inde: Institut Français de Pondichéry - IFP, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement - IRD. Retrieved from <https://neemsis.hypotheses.org/> (Networks, Employment, dEbt, Mobilities and Skills in India Survey (NEEMSIS))

Singh, J. K., Misra, G., & Raad, B. D. (2013, nov). Personality Structure in the Trait Lexicon of Hindi, a Major Language Spoken in India. *European Journal of Personality*, 27(6), 605–620. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1940> doi: 10.1002/per.1940

Trizano-Hermosilla, I., & Alvarado, J. M. (2016, may). Best Alternatives to Cronbach's Alpha Reliability in Realistic Conditions: Congeneric and Asymmetrical Measure-

ments. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00769> doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00769

Valerio, A., Sanchez Puerta, M. L., Pierre, G., Rajadel, T., & Monroy Taborda, S. (2014, June). *STEP Skills Measurement Program - Snapshot 2014* (Tech. Rep.). Washington, DC, USA: The World Bank. Retrieved from <https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/step/about>

Tables and figures




Figure 13: Distribution of acquiescence bias according to year – For 953 individuals in 2016-17 and 1,316 in 2020-21 from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 14: Cumulative distribution of acquiescence bias – For 953 individuals in 2016-17 and 1,316 in 2020-21 from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMESIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.

Table 1: Details for personality test questions

Variable	Question	Big-5 traits
curious	Are you curious, interested in learning new things?	OP
interestbyart	Are you interested in nature, art or music?	OP
repetitivetasks	Do you prefer work that involves repetitive tasks and routines?	OP
inventive	Are you inventive, and discover new ways of doing things?	OP
liketothink	Do you like to think a lot, and reflect about ideas?	OP
newideas	Do you come up with original or new ideas?	OP
activeimagination	Do you have an active imagination?	OP
organized	Are you organized?	CO
makeplans	Do you make plans and stick to them?	CO
workhard	Do you work hard to do things well and on time?	CO
appointmentontime	Do you get to work and appointments on time?	CO
putoffduties	Do you put off your duties in order to relax?	CO
easilydistracted	Do you get easily distracted?	CO
completeduties	Do you complete your duties on time?	CO
enjoypeople	Do you enjoy being with people?	EX
sharefeelings	Do you easily share your thoughts and feelings with other people?	EX
shywithpeople	Are you shy with people?	EX
enthusiastic	Are you enthusiastic and full of energy?	EX
talktomanypeople	In social gatherings, do you like to talk to many people?	EX
talkative	Are you talkative?	EX
expressedthoughts	Are you comfortable expressing your thoughts and opinions to others?	EX
workwithother	Do you work well with other people?	AG
understandotherfeeling	Do you try to understand how other people feel and think?	AG
trustingofother	Are you generally trusting of other people?	AG
rudetoother	Do you tend to be rude to other people?	AG
toleratefaults	Do you tolerate faults in other people?	AG
forgiveother	Do you forgive other people easily?	AG
helpfulwithothers	Are you helpful with others?	AG
managestress	Do you manage stress well?	ES
nervous	Do you get nervous easily?	ES
changemood	Do you have sudden changes in your mood?	ES
feeldepressed	Do you feel sad, depressed?	ES
easilyupset	Do you get easily upset?	ES
worryalot	Do you worry a lot?	ES
staycalm	Do you stay calm in tense or stressful situations?	ES

Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21)




Figure 15: Distribution of acquiescence bias according to sex, caste and gender – For 953 individuals in 2016-17 and 1,316 in 2020-21 from rural Tamil Nadu, India.
Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 16: McDonald's ω – For 953 individuals in 2016-17 and 1,316 in 2020-21 from rural Tamil Nadu, India.
Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 17: Internal consistency of Big-5 personality traits – Distribution of McDonald's Ω through time and correction for 953 individuals in 2016-17 and 1,316 in 2020-21 from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.





Figure 18: Stability over time of Big-5 personality traits non-corrected from acquiescence bias – Distribution of the difference of the score between 2016-17 and 2020-21 for Big-5 personality traits non-corrected from acquiescence bias for 835 individuals from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.



Traits corrected from acquiescence bias.

Figure 19: Stability over time of Big-5 personality traits corrected from acquiescence bias – Distribution of the difference of the score between 2016-17 and 2020-21 for Big-5 personality traits corrected from acquiescence bias for 835 individuals from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.




Figure 20: Stability over time of cognitive skills – Distribution of the difference of the score between 2016-17 and 2020-21 for three cognitive skills for 835 individuals from rural Tamil Nadu, India.

Source: NEEMSIS-1 (2016-17) & NEEMSIS-2 (2020-21); author's calculations.

A Factor analysis for personality traits




Figure 21: Results of factor analysis for 2016-17 raw items
Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17); author's calculations.




Figure 22: Correlation between Factor from EFA and Big-5 personality traits
Source: NEEMESIS-1 (2016-17); author's calculations.

Contents

1 Introduction	2
Definition	3
Exogeneity of personality traits and cognitive skills	3
2 Data	5
3 Methodology	6
3.1 Construction of personality traits & cognitive skills variables	6
3.2 Factor analysis	6
4 Results	8
4.1 Acquiescence bias	8
4.2 Internal consistency	9
4.3 Factor analysis	9
5 Corrected items	10
6 Non-corrected items	12
7 Factor analysis	14
References	16
Tables and figures	20
Appendix	25
A Factor analysis for personality traits	25