UNIT 4 KEY ISSUES IN PERSONALITY

Structure

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Besides the grand theories in personality, there is much more to be incorporated in the study of personality. There are several issues in the study of personality that have either remained unresolved or are still in the process of resolution.In this unit you will learn about the impact of heredity on personality and the various research studies that have been conducted to ascertain the relationship between these two factors. The unit also gives a glimpse of the heredity versus environment debate and points out the many research work in regard to this area and the conclusions that have been arrived at based on the research. An attempt has also been made in this unit to present the person versus situation controversy wherein it has been pointed out as to how the consistency in behaviour across situations is questioned. The interactionist approach in regard to this issue has been elaborated. This unit also presents the idiographic versus nomothetic approach to personality in which context the cross cultural issues have also been dealt with. The research in the five factor model's explanation of personality have been listed and it has been pointed out as how this theory has been more popular and the reasons for the same.

4.1 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- Describe the various issues in personality;

- Explain the controversies in the study of personality;

- Analyse the various sub-issues still unanswered in the field of personality; and

- List out the ways to fill up the lacunae existing in personality research.

Some of the major issues in personality research are being discussed in the following sections:

4.2 GENES AND PERSONALITY

Nature versus nurture is probably the oldest issue in psychology. This is an age old dispute among behavioural psychologists, philosophers, theologians, and theorists of consciousness. "Nature versus nurture" is a term coined by the English Victorian Polymath Francis Galton regarding the influence of heredity and environment on the development of personality. .

4.2.1 Nature versus Nurture Debate

The nature versus nurture debate basically relates to the relative importance of an individual's inherent traits versus the personal experiences that lead to individual differences in physical and behavioural traits.

Some scientists are of the view that genetic predispositions or even animal instincts are the push factors behind people's behaviour. Others believe that the way one behaves is directly dependent upon the manner in which the person has been taught to behave. The former is known as the "nature" theory of human behaviour whereas the latter is termed as the "nurture" theory of human behaviour. Sir Francis Galton was fascinated by the idea of genetic pre-programming and tried to uncover the predestined ways of human beings. However, many of his experiments proved ill-conceived but yet his contribution has been vital to the study of personality issues. The technique of finger printing and the Word Association Test are the end products of Galton's contribution.

It has been stated that at the time of birth the child has no specific traits except that it functions through its reflexes. As the child grows day by day, and in the process of socialisation it learns many things in regard to the environemtn. It is said that the child thus at birth is in a blank state of mind or 'tabula rasa', and whatever one wants to put into it, the same would be absorbed and the child's behaviour accordingly will change. This view which holds that "nurture" yields all or almost all the behavioural traits in the individual child. Thus the environment (nurture) plays a significant role in the development of the child's personality.

However, the fast growing understanding of the human genome has come up with the ofnformation that both the sides are right in their own part. Whereas nature provides us with inherent abilities and traits, nurture reshapes these genetic tendencies and molds them with progressive learning and maturity. This view

point which agrees that both nature and nurture play crucial roles in human personality development has come to be known as interactionism.

4.2.2   The Nature Theory – Heredity

It has been demonstrated by scientists that traits such as eye color and hair color are decided by specific genes that are embedded and encoded in each human cell. The things have been taken a step further by the nature theory that formulates in more recent times it has also been shown that the more abstract traits such as intelligence, personality, aggression and sexual orientation are also encoded in an individual's DNA. This has led to the concept of behavioural genes which can justify criminal acts or criminal behaviours.

Another debated issue in context of nature theory is the occurrence of "gay gene" that points to a genetic component to sexual orientation.

If there is no role of genetics, then fraternal twins brought up under the same environmental conditions, would be alike, even though differences exist in their genetic make up. But, according to the studies, they closely resemble each other as compared to non-twin brothers and sisters.

4.2.3   The Nurture Theory – Environment

The proponents of the nurture theory are of the view that genetic tendencies ultimately do not matter. They believe that our behavioural aspects originate only from the environmental forces in our upbringing.

American psychologist John Watson, a strong proponent of environmental learning, demonstrated that disorders like phobia could also be explained by classical conditioning.

Today, known as the Father of Behavioral Science, B.F. Skinner proved that human behaviour could be conditioned in much the same way as animals.

Even if reared apart, identical twins should have been exactly the same in all respects if environment had no role to play.

4.2.4   Twin Studies

Twin studies are an important tool in resolving the nature versus nurture argument. Identical twins or Monozygotic twins, are siblings who have exact duplicates of their genotypes. They best indicate that whether biological dispositions affect traits and psychopathology in human beings.

Fraternal twins, disygotic twins share exactly half the number of genes with each other. They are a very good basis for comparison of identical twins. Twin studies usually rely on samples of identical and fraternal twins. Some of the important studies on twins and related findings are presented below.

A study was conducted to determine the heritability of attitudes among twins, as well as the genetic variables, such as intelligence, that can play a role in affecting the attitudes among pairs of twins. The results of the study showed partial correlation between the attitudes of the participants with their genetic factors. Also, correlation existed between the attitudes related to self-reported perspectives or to activities. For example, the subjects were asked to rate themselves on the

trait of sociability through a survey. The trait was correlated with 5 out of 6 attitudes factors that the subjects had towards sociability.

It was also found that non-shared environment experiences between pairs are the strongest cause of attitude variances that overshadowed genetic predispositions as well as shared environment experiences (Olson et al., 2001). Non-shared environment refers to a condition in which something in the environment directly affects one twin but no impact occurs on the other at all (Van denOord, 2000).

A Swedish study was conducted to measure personality traits of extraversion and neuroticism among the twin pairs, impulsivity trait and family environment and socio-economic status. The findings showed that the genotypes and the environment interaction is an important concept in twin studies as it can also be applied to the way people with the same genotypes might respond to similar environment.

Our particular genotype environment, labeled Type I, indicates that the environment plays a more significant role with a genotype for low scores on a specific personality trait. It means that individuals with low genotypes for extraversion would also score low on extraversion. Type-II genotype that is, the environment interaction, on the other hand, is exactly the opposite of Type-I.

4.2.5 Infant Shyness

An adoption study was conducted to uncover the reasons behind why some infants are open and responsive to attention, some take a bit longer to open up while some others are withdrawn. It is difficult to tell whether babies are shy because of the environment in which they are brought up as their mothers are shy or because they inherit the shyness traits from their mothers.

Adoptive parents were given questionnaires that asked them to rate their infants on the measure of shyness. The results revealed that in non-adoptive families, the parents with high shyness rates also had shy infants. One significant conclusion revealed that those biological mothers who rated high on shyness, had their adopted babies as also shy. This shows some evidence of the effect of a genetic link on family environment (Daniels & Plomin, 1985).

4.2.6 Anti-social Personality Disorder

Attempts have been made to see whether children who are at risk for antisocial personality disorder develop symptoms in an adoptive family or gets protection against the disorder in such environment. Results have revealed that anti-social personality disorder is more prevalent in adopted children having biological risk factors. Results further revealed that if both the biological parents and adoptive parents come from criminal background, there is high incidence of an element of criminal tendencies in the offspring.

For various reasons the interpretation of the results of adoption studies is very difficult and valid conclusions cannot be made. Genetic factors are "simulated" when the adoptive family environment is similar to the biological environment.

4.2.7 Family Studies

However, not as valid as twin and adoption studies, but still family studies play an important role in resolving the heredity versus environment debate. These are

mainly used to identify the degree of risk of developing mental disorders by relatives and other family members. Such studies are mainly used to determine the risk of inheritance of mental disorders to offspring within families. These types of studies are performed using molecular genetic studies where the DNA from the participant's blood samples is taken and the observed behaviour is projected.

Self Assessment Questions

1) What role does heredity play in the shaping of one's personality?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

2) What role does environment play in the constitution of one's personality?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

3) Discuss the nature-nurture debate in the study of personality.

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

4) How do genes affect the psychopathology of behaviour?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

5) What does the genotype – environment interaction convey regarding personality?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

4.3　THE PERSON-SITUATION CONTROVERSY

The person situation debate was sparked off by a prominent book by Mischel in 1968, in which the trait approach to personality was targeted. According to Mischel, the traits when rated, do not predict the actual behaviour. Opposed to Mischel's view, Epstein, in 1983, argued that although traits do not predict single behaviour, they are good at predicting aggregates of such behaviours.

Broady and Ehrlichman (1998) devised the following hypothetical study to test whether traits are good at predicting behaviour across not only in the same situation, but also across different situations. For this, the following steps were taken:

Step 1: Obtained measures of behaviour for a group of individuals in each of twenty situations that were assumed to be relevant to the trait of conscientiousness.

Step 2: Assumed further that each individual has been observed several times in a situation and that the measure of behaviour in a situation for each individual is based on an aggregate index of behaviour.

Step 3: The set of situations was divided into two arbitrary groups of ten each.

Step 4: Obtained two aggregated indices of conscientiousness for each individual by averaging the person's score for each of the two groups of ten situations.

Step 5: Obtained a correlation between the two indices.

Step 6: Obtained an overall index of conscientiousness for each individual by averaging the aggregated behavioural measures for each of the twenty situations studied.

The findings showed that the person situation debate was an extended disagreement, originally between social psychologists and personality psychologists, on whether the "situation" or the personality traits are more predictive of people's behaviour.

Mischel argued that (1) literature review shows that personality traits only have a correlation of about .30 with how people behave in a given situation, and (2) the cross-situational consistency of behaviour is also just .20-.30. So, he concluded that situations, rather than personality traits are better predictors of behaviour.

These arguments further generated a lot of response from personality psychologists using trait questionnaires for several decades. Those on the side of personality argued that the low personality-behaviour correlations do not prove that situational variables are more valuable.

The actual relationship between personality and behaviour was found to be higher than .40.

Personality is a stronger predictor of behaviour across all situations but not a strong predictor of an individual's behaviour at a specific time in a specific situation.

Personality traits are the most useful psychological tools that predict behaviour most strongly.

4.3.1 The Behavioural Consistency Controversy

Departing from the trait approaches view that internal relatively stable forces of personality exert a consistent effect on behaviour, another view proposes that no consistent traits are reflected by an individual's responses to any situation, rather traits vary according to the situation.

Hartshorne and May (1928) conducted a classic study on honesty in children. Children were exposed to situations where they could get a chance to behave dishonestly and that too without getting detected. The results showed that the children were not consistent on either of the ends (honestly or dishonesty), but they behaved specific to the situation. It was proposed by Walter Mischel (1968, 1978) that people can learn to make quite different responses to similar stimuli as per past reinforcements provided to them. So, before deciding a person's response to any specific stimuli, the perceptual and cognitive process should be taken into account.

According to Mischel, the significance of situational variables or personality variables should be determined while conducting research in personality. It is basically determined by the strength and weakness of the situation. If everyone makes the same interpretation and draws uniform expectancies to a situation presented to them, then situational variables stand more important. On the other hand, ambiguity in situations represents greater influence of personality variables in behaviour.

Later on Mischel (1985) also proposed that people exhibit consistent modes of responding, implying that consistency appears in situations where people behave inadequately. Researchers like Magnusson and Endler (1977) also believe that prediction of behaviour is done not only in terms of traits or situations alone, rather some combination (interaction) of the two must be attended and referred to. Various theories are now being developed that follow the interactionist approach.

4.4 INTERACTIONIST APPROACH TO SITUATION VS. PERSON DEBATE

If one formulates that traits and situations interact to influence behaviour, then the formula for this could be as given below:

Behavior = personality × appraisal of the situation.

It is an important fact that individual differences exist in personality-situation relationship. High self monitors try to adapt more to the situation and thus, display less consistency across situations in their behaviour.

Thus one may state that some individuals show more consistent behaviour and that traits do not influence behaviour consistently and emerge only in some situations. Another aspect is that whatever people do, it exhibits their traits. e.g. choice of careers, choice of lifestyle etc.

Almost all researches have demonstrated that personality traits exist and are predictive of behaviour. Some research has shown the correlation between situations and behavioural outcomes to be ranging from 0.36 to 0.42 which is

almost identical to predictive power of personality traits. How far situations determine behaviour even against one's value system is an important issue here.

In this context, one of the studies was on the obedience factor carried out by Stanley Milgram in which he used fake electric shock to study how people react when they cause harm to others. Given in the box below is the experiment:

The psychologist Stanley Milgram created an electric 'shock generator' with 30 switches. The switch was marked clearly in 15 volt increments, ranging from 15 to 450 volts.

He also placed labels indicating the shock level, such as 'Moderate' (75-120 Volts) and 'Strong' (135-180 Volts). The switches 375-420 Volts were marked 'Danger: Severe Shock' and the two highest levels 435-450, was marked 'XXX'.

The 'shock generator' was in fact phony and would only produce sound when the switches were pressed.

40 subjects participated all males. They thought they were going to participate in an experiment about 'memory and learning'. Next, the subject met an 'experimenter', the person leading the experiment, and another person told to be another subject. The other subject was in fact a confederate(experimenter's man) acting as a subject. He was a 47 year old male accountant.

The two subjects (the real subject and the confederate subject) drew slips of paper to indicate who was going to be a 'teacher' and who was going to be a 'learner'. The lottery was in fact a set-up, and the real subject would always get the role of 'the teacher'.

The teacher saw that the learner was strapped to a chair and electrodes were attached. The subject was then seated in another room in front of the shock generator, unable to see the learner.

The Stanley Milgram Experiment aimed at getting an answer to the question: *"For how long will someone continue to give shocks to another person if they are told to do so, even if they thought they could be seriously hurt?" (the dependent variable)*

Remember that they had met the other person, a likable stranger, and that they thought that it could very well be them who were in the learner-position receiving shocks.

The subject was instructed to teach word-pairs to the learner. When the learner made a mistake, the subject was instructed to punish the learner by giving him a shock, 15 volts higher for each mistake.

The learner never received the shocks, but pre-taped audio was triggered when a shock-switch was pressed.

If the experimenter, seated in the same room, was contacted, the experimenter would answer with predefined 'prods' ("Please continue", "Please go on", "The experiment requires that you go on", "It is absolutely essential that you continue", "You have no other choice, you must go on"), starting with the mild prods, and making it more authoritarian for each time the subject contacted the experimenter.

> If the subject asked who was responsible if anything would happen to the learner, the experimenter answered "I am responsible". This gave the subject a relief and many continued.
>
> During the Stanley Milgram Experiment, many subjects showed signs of tension. 3 subjects had "full-blown, uncontrollable seizures".
>
> Although most subjects were uncomfortable doing it, all 40 subjects obeyed up to 300 volts.
>
> 25 of the 40 subjects continued to complete to give shocks until the maximum level of 375 volts was reached.
>
> Before the Stanley Milgram Experiment, experts thought that about 1-3 % of the subjects would not stop giving shocks. They thought that you'd have to be pathological or a psychopath to do so.
>
> Still, 65 % never stopped giving shocks. None stopped when the learner said he had heart-trouble. How could that be?
>
> **We now believe that it has to do with our almost innate behaviour that we should do as told, especially from authority persons.**
>
> *Source:* http://www.experiment-resources.com/stanley-milgram-experiment. html#ixzz13wADcJx9

However, the end of the debate was not completely one sided. It has also been argued that trait psychologists could still not explain why behaviour has low consistency over short periods, remaining at 0.30 ranges. On the other hand, situations could also no longer take a stand that traits are not as important as situations. This state of affairs made out a resolution that changed the conceptions of psychologists of both traits and situations.

Regarding traits, psychologists learned that they do not have cross cultural consistency for individual behaviours, but over time, they create consistency for wide behaviour distributions. For situations, psychologists learned that situations are not the only thing that matters.

On the basis of these formulations, a new definition of personality can be framed which states that personality is one's pattern of behavioural stability and change due to the unique combination of having certain traits and being in certain situations. Therefore, the current requirement in the area of personality is to understand which of the person and situation forces account for patterns of stability and change in behaviour.

The person-situation debate was a challenging task yet ultimately constructive argument for personality psychology (Fleeson, 2004). By forcing psychologists to think carefully about the links between behaviour, personality and situations, the person-situation debate acted as a catalyst for a deeper appreciation of the importance of personality and for a more sophisticated understanding of why people do what they do.

4.5   NOMOTHETIC APPROACH VERSUS IDIOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO PERSONALITY

Personality related psychological research and studies are grouped in three main groups, viz., (i) nomothetic, (ii) idiographic and (iii) complementary approaches to personality.

4.5.1 Nomothetic Approach

Nomethetic approaches are based on the tendency to see one's personality as constant, hereditary and resistant to change, whereas the influence of the environment is minimal. This way, nomothetic approaches state that the way in which a person will act under certain circumstances can be calculated and anticipated, foreseen. Gordon Allport (1934) identified this approach to personality testing. The nomothetic approach relies on quantitative research methods such as self report and questionnaires to establish universal behaviours. He understood that scientific progress for trait psychology was rooted in a nomothetic approach.

Thus, nomothetically derived traits were employed by Allport to describe people. Allport (1937, 1961) employed traits as the primary basis which can be used to describe people. Accordingly, he descriebd a trait as a "neuropsychic structure that possesses the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent. Allport also assumed that traits are real. He formulated that traits are distinct and particular to each person and their assessment shall be done uniquely.

4.5.2 Idiographic Approach

Allport also promoted another approach named as idiographic approach to the study of personality. Here every individual is regarded as a combined system that can be independently analysed scientifically. It means that each individual is examined deeply and no general laws are considered important that are beyond the individual to be studied.

Under the idiographic process, he believed that a person's traits can be put into various compartments according to their pervasiveness in an individual's personality. The most pervasive traits were referred to as "cardinal" dispositions by Allport. If present, cardinal traits dominate the behaviour of an individual aggressiveness, calmness etc. may be taken as examples. Another set of traits, known as "central dispositions" comprise those that are pervasive for a given individual. For example, the traits talked about while writing a letter of recommendation. More situational specific traits are termed as "Secondary dispositions". Allport argued that each person possesses a unique pattern of cardinal, central and secondary traits and to understand a person, the unique-pattern examination is required.

Thus, the above discussion explains that the differences between a nomothetic and an idiographic approach is not just a question of discovering on the part of the psychologist, but also the methods employed are considered useful.

The nomothetic point of view has experiments, correlation, psychometric testing and other quantitative methods as its examples. On the other hand, the idiographic methods include case studies, informal interviews, unstructured observation and other qualitative methods.

Self Assessment Questions

1) What is the person-situation controversy?

....

....

2) What- the person or the environment exert more influence in structuring a person's personality?

....

....

....

....

....

3) How does the interactionist approach handle the person-situation debate?

....

....

....

....

....

4) Discuss the nomothetic view to personality.

....

....

....

....

....

5) Discuss the idiographic view to personality.

....

....

....

....

....

4.6 CROSS CULTURAL ISSUES

Personality and culture are interwoven and still their relationship cannot be comprehended well. But it is also true that the culture of an individual is not the sole determiner of an individual's personality. The framework of individualism versus collectivism can be utilised to observe this as it predisposes individualism or collectivism. It is one of basic differences that have been described in varying national cultures. Factors such as personal achievement, egalitarian relationships, role flexibility team and familial connections etc. are used to describe personality traits and differences between individuals of various cultures (Hofstede, 2001). However, it is not possible to attribute all the factors under individualism-collectivism web only to the cultural influence. The framework of individualism

collectivism is mainly used to describe personality characteristics traits and habits generating from within cultures where certain individualist or collectivist traits occur.

An element of doubt gets raised up while applying the principles of this framework in personality perception of an individual as it may lead to stereotyping and misinterpreting of an individual's personality and his characteristic of behaviour. The individualism famework can be of more use in describing cultural tendencies as a whole rather than describing individual characteristics and traits. However, this does not imply that the individualism collectivism paradigm is naïve and can be excluded in studying the domain of personality. It can be easily inferred from the above discussion that the interplay between personality and culture is quite complex. It is also clear that even in adulthood, personality can be affected by cultural expectations. Simultaneously, this is also to be acknowledged that this individualism -collectivism orientation is not the only determining factor of personality.

4.7 PERSONALITY TRAITS AND FIVE FACTOR MODEL

As defined by McCrae & Costa in 1990, "Personality traits are the dimensions of individual differences in tendencies to show consistent patterns of thoughts feelings and actions." Psychologists working in the area of personality like Raymond Cattell, Eysenck have noted that organisation of traits can be done in much smaller clusters of similar trait rather than studying each of the 4,000 traits as identified by Allport and Odbert. Thus, a parsimonious structure of traits can help a great deal in personality research.

Ending the decades long dispute about the mot suitable personality structure, the Five Factor Model developed by McCrae & John, 1992 came up with five factors or dimensions viz. Neuroticism (N),Extroversion (E), Openness to Experience (O),Agreeableness (A) and conscientiousness (C). Individuals high in neuroticism are likely to be anxious, irritable and low at emotional end and those low in neuroticism are calm and emotionally stable. Extroverts are sociable, cheerful and outgoing; introverts are shy and sober. Open men and women are curious whereas closed people are run by conventions. Agreeable people are compassionate, modest whereas conscientious are mainly driven by punctuality and purposefulness.

Originally, the five factor model was discovered by analysing the English language trait names and individuals standing on each of the five factors could be measured by asking them to rate themselves on a series of adjectives (Goldeberg, 1992). The most widely used measure of the Five Factor Model is the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R, Costa & McCrae, 1992). It assesses 30 specific traits, six for each of the five factors.

4.7.1 The Five Factor Model Across Cultures

Personality factors in trait adjectives from different languages have been examined with lexical studies and mixed results have surfaced from these studies which show that E, A and C factors almost always appear but N and O disappear from the picture sometimes. It is not clear whether these factors are not there in the culture itself or are missing from the set of adjectives studied.

Thus, great caution should be used while comparing the personality scores across cultures. Personality traits are expressed differently in different cultures and a single set of questionnaire items does not suffice in every culture.

Self Assessment Questions

1) Discuss the cross- cultural issue in personality.

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

2) What does the Five- Factor Model propose regarding personality?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

3) Discuss the characteristic issue underlying Five- Factor Model across cultures.

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

4.8 ISSUES RELATING TO THEORETICAL MODELS

For the understanding and explanation of personality, various theoretical models have been proposed. The different models have explained personality with respect to their theoretical propositions e.g. the Psychoanalytic theory explains personality taking intra-psychic and conscious-unconscious mind into account whereas the Behaviorist model totally rejects this approach and emphasises the role of learning and environment in the shaping and development of personality. The Humanistic Model takes a different approach. It is true that every model seems to be correct from its own perspective but when we consider the other models, many of their features become redundant, irrelevant and may be invalid. Therefore, one, who is interested in understanding the phenomenon of personality by going through various theoretical accounts, may not be able to have a clear view of the personality as construct. Therefore, there is a need of an eclectic model which incorporates the features of various models into it and aids in shaping of personality.

Some other issues in personality that need to be attended to at length are:

1) *Free will vs determinism.* Means that whether our behaviour is directed by freedom intrinsic to our nature or by the ultimately determined forces.

2) *Uniqueness vs Universality.* Implies that whether each person is unique in his own existence or is driven by some universal behaviour patterns.

3) *Physiological vs purposive motivation.* Some researchers assume that we are pushed by basic physiological needs like food, water etc. while others are of the view that we are pulled by our purpose, goals, values, principles etc.

4) *Conscious vs Unconscious motivation.* Some researchers believe that our behaviour and experience are determined by conscious forces whereas others say that we are not aware of the forces driving our behaviour, i.e. the unconscious element.

5) *Stage vs Non-stage theories of development.* It is an extension of the nature nurture issue that whether or not we all pass through predetermined stages of development like fetal, childhood, puberty, adulthood, senescence-controlled basically by genetics.

6) *Cultural determinism vs Cultural transcendence.* To what extent our personality is molded by our cultures is the issue here. If not determined by culture, our transcendence is some other kind of determinism.

7) *Early Vs Late Personality Formation.* This issue deals with if our personality characteristics are established in early childhood or it is quite flexible in adulthood. This question relates to the issues of genetics, external determination etc. Here, the major limitation resolution is the confusion in defining personality characteristics.

8) *Optimism Vs Pessimism.* Whether humans are basically good or bad is the central issue here. The attitude determines what we see when we look at humanity.

4.9 LET US SUM UP

To sum up, it can be said that the issues in personality consider classic and more recent issues that are fundamental to the field of personality psychology. However, various theorists have contributed to our understanding of personality but their varying view points have led to various controversies that are still posing a challenge to the area of personality. These issues need a timely resolution so that the research in personality could be more refined and stable and the core areas could be dealt with more precision and flawlessly.

4.10 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1) Discuss the Nature- Nurture debate in the study of personality.

2) Discuss with examples what role does the environment play in molding an individual's personality.

3) What does the person-situation controversy depict about personality structure of a person?

4) "The interactionist approach gives a mid-way to person- situation controversy" . Discuss.

5) "The cross-cultural issue in personality is difficult to be resolved" . Why?

6) What are the theoretical and methodological flaws in personality research?

7) What does the nomothetic versus idiographic debate in personality present?

8) What role can the Five- Factor Model play in resolving the Theoretical controversy in personality research?

4.11 GLOSSARY

Idiographic approach	:	The psychological study of the single case/ individual.
Genes	:	The essential elements in the transmission of hereditary characteristics.
Nature	:	The genetic factors contributing to behaviour and perception.
Nature vs Nurture controversy	:	The argument concerning the relative roles of the contributions of nature and nurture in the development of organisms.
Nomothetic approach	:	Attempts to discover personality principles that apply to people in general.
Nurture	:	Environmental factors contributing to behaviour and perception.
Personality	:	The various enduring and distinctive patterns of behaviour and thought that are characteristic of a particular person.

4.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Ewen, R. B. (2003). *An Introduction to Theories of Personality*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kim, U., & Hakkoe, H. (1994). *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications*. Berkeley, CA: SAGE Publications.

McCrae, R., & Allik, K. (2002). *The Five Factor Model of Perosnality Across Cultures*. New York, Springer.

McCrae, R. R. (2002). NEO-PI-R data from 36 cultures: Further intercultural comparisons. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Cultures* (pp. 105-126). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

References

Allik, J., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Toward a geography of personality traits: Patterns of profiles across 36 cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35, 13-28.

Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait names: A psycho-lexical study. Psychological Monographs, 47, (1 Whole No. 211).

Black, J. (2000). Personality testing and police selection: Utility of the 'Big Five'. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 29, 2-9.

Blickle, G. (1996). Personality traits, learning strategies, and performance. European Journal of Personality, 10, 337-352.

Cheung, F. M., & Leung, K. (1998). Indigenous personality measures: Chinese examples. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29, 233-248.

Church, A. T. (2009). Prospects for an integrated trait and cultural psychology. European Journal of Personality, 23, 153-182.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81, 322-331.

De Raad, B., & Perugini, M. (Eds.). (in press). Big Five assessment. Gottingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

Draguns, J. R., Krylova, A. V., Oryol, V. E., Rukavishnikov, A. A., & Martin, T. A. (2000). Personality characteristics of the Nentsy in the Russian Arctic. American Behavioral Scientist, 44, 126-140.

Epstein, Seymour. 1979. The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37: 1097–1126.

Fleeson, William. 2001. Towards a Structure- and Process-Integrated View of Personality: Traits as Density Distributions of States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80: 1011–1027.

Fleeson, William. 2004. Moving Personality Beyond the Person-Situation Debate: The Challenge and Opportunity of Within-Person Variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 13: 83–87.

Funder, David C. 2005. Toward a Resolution of the Personality Triad: Persons, Situations, and Behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality* 40: 21–34.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure Psychological Assessment, 4, 26-42.

Guimond, S., Brunot, S., Chatard, A., Garcia, D. M., Martinot, D., Branscombe, N. R., et al. (2007). Culture, gender, and the self: Variations and impact of social comparison processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92, 1118-1134.

Guthrie, G. M., & Bennett, A. B. (1971). Cultural differences in implicit personality theory. International Journal of Psychology, 6, 305-312.

Halim, M. S. (2001). Coping and quality of life in Indonesian breast cancer patients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of Nijmegen.

Heine, S. J., Buchtel, E. E., & Norenzayan, A. (2008). What do cross-national comparisons of personality traits tell us?: The case of conscientiousness. Psychological Science, 19, 309-313.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organisations across nations (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. Cross-Cultural Research, 38, 52-88.

Jang, K. L., McCrae, R. R., Angleitner, A., Riemann, R., & Livesley, W. J. (1998). Heritability of facet-level traits in a cross-cultural twin sample: Support for a hierarchical model of personality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1556-1565.

Jung, C. J. (1976). The portable Jung. (J. Campbell, Ed.) New York, NY: Penguin Books.

McCrae, R. R. (2001). Trait psychology and culture: Exploring intercultural comparisons. Journal of Personality, 69, 819-846.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2003). Personality in adulthood: A Five-Factor Theory perspective (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. Journal of Personality, 60, 175-215.

McCrae, R. R., Terracciano, A., & 78 Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project. (2005a). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. Journal of Persoanlity and Social Psychology, 88, 547-561.

Mischel, Walter. 1968. *Personality and Assessment*. New York: Wiley.

Mischel, Walter, and Yuichi Shoda. 1995. A Cognitive-Affective System Theory of Personality: Reconceptualising Situations, Dispositions, Dynamics, and Invariance in Personality Structure. *Psychological Review* 102: 246–268.

Perugini, M., & Richetin, J. (2007). In the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king. European Journal of Personality, 21, 977-981.

Piedmont, R. L., Bain, E., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2002). The applicability of the Five-Factor Model in a Sub-Saharan culture: The NEO-PI-R in Shona. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), The Five-Factor Model of personality across cultures (pp. 155-173). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Poortinga, Y. H., Van de Vijver, F., & Van Hemert, D. A. (2002). Cross-cultural equivalence of the Big Five: A tentative interpretation of the evidence. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), The Five-Factor Model across cultures (pp. 273-294). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Somer, O., & Goldberg, L. R. (1999). The structure of Turkish trait-descriptive adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 431-450.

Terracciano, A., Abdel-Khalak, A. M., Adam, N., Adamovova, L., Ahn, C.-k., Ahn, H.-n., et al. (2005). National character does not reflect mean personality trait levels in 49 cultures. Science, 310, 96-100.

Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1992). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. Journal of Personality, 60, 225-251. (Original work published 1961)

Yang, J., Dai, X., Yao, S., Cai, T., Gao, B., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2002). Personality disorders and the Five-Factor Model of personality in Chinese psychiatric patients. In P. T. Costa, Jr. & T. A. Widiger (Eds.), Personality disorders and the Five-Factor Model of personality (2nd ed., pp. 215-221). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Yang, K. S., & Lee, P. H. (1971). Likeability, meaningfulness and familiarity of 557 Chinese adjectives for personality trait description. Acta Psychologica Taiwanica, 13, 36-37. (in Chinese)