



The many faces of personality: The DSM-5 dimensional and categorical models and the five-factor model



Cornelia Pocnet^{a,*}, Jean-Philippe Antonietti^a, Philippe Handschin^a, Koorosh Massoudi^{a,b}, Jérôme Rossier^{a,b}

^a Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

^b Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research LIVES (NCCR), University of Lausanne, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Maladaptive traits
PID-5
Personality disorders
Personality traits

ABSTRACT

The classical nosographical approach to personality disorders leads to a set of categories that may be considered to be both conceptually and empirically problematic. In this regard, the DSM-5 includes an alternative dimensional model for which the Personality Inventory Disorders (PID-5) has been developed. Our study compares this alternative dimensional model in regards to both personality disorder categories and normal personality dimensions. The 537 participants in our study, 65.4% of whom were women, completed both the PID-5 and the International Personality Disorder Examination (IPDE) screening questionnaire. Among these participants, 273 participants (64.1% women) also completed the revised version of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI-R). A multiple factor analysis indicated that two higher-order principal dimensions described the relationships between the PID-5 and both the IPDE and the NEO-FFI-R. These relationships were analyzed in greater detail using a Principal Axis Factor Analysis. Five and four, respectively, intercorrelated lower-level factors were considered after a parallel analysis that confirmed to a certain extent that normal and abnormal personalities share a common underlying structure. Finally, a multiple regression bootstrap series confirmed the close associations between the PID-5 and both the IPDE and the NEO-FFI-R scales. Our results indicate that the PID-5 offers an alternative perspective for describing symptom syndromes with personality pathology.

1. Introduction

Several studies have found that the DSM-IV conceptualization of PDs poses a number of problems, a situation that emphasizes how the categorical nature of this taxonomy compromises their diagnostic validity (Shedler & Westen, 2004; Clark, 2007; Widiger & Trull, 2007; Livesley, 2010). Accordingly, various authors have made the case for a dimensional conceptualization of PDs, such as the five-factor model (FFM) (Lynam & Widiger, 2001). This problem was addressed prior to and as part of the development of the DSM-5 (APA, 2013), from which an alternative dimensional model emerged that was supplemented by the personality inventory for the DSM-5 (PID-5) assessment instrument (Krueger et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the APA decided to retain the DSM-IV categorical approach to PDs in its fifth edition but included a hybrid as an appendix and offered free online access to the PID-5 for researchers to assess its psychometric properties and pertinence (APA, 2013).

1.1. Dimensional models of normal and abnormal personalities

Dimensional models of personality mainly emerged from research on the normal personality, with the main goal of identifying the basic dimensions that form the structure of personality. While the FFM (McCrae & Costa, 2008) suggests that five main dimensions accurately and succinctly describe personality traits, Digman (1997) suggests a two-factor higher-order structure. The first factor (α) is positively associated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability and has been interpreted as a socialization factor that reflects an array of socially desirable personality traits or expresses personality development through socialization. The second factor (β) is positively associated with extraversion and openness and may reflect a tendency towards personal growth, as theorized by Rogers (1961) and Maslow (1968). De Young (2010) suggests that these two dimensions may reflect two biological systems that have broad impact on both brain function and personality. Stability, which corresponds to α , appears to represent a general tendency to regulate or restrain potentially disruptive emotion and behavior, whereas plasticity, which corresponds to

* Corresponding author at: Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, Géopolis, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.
E-mail address: Cornelia_Pocnet2003@yahoo.fr (C. Pocnet).

β , appears to represent a general tendency to explore and engage in possibilities. Finally, Musek (2007) raises the question of a single general first-order factor, the big one, which is positively associated with both stability and plasticity, as well as all five dimensions of the FFM domains other than neuroticism, which is negatively associated with this general factor. The big one has been interpreted as an evolutionary-based evaluation component (Saucier & Goldberg, 2003) that expresses socially desirable versus undesirable personality characteristics (Musek, 2007).

Several dimensional abnormal personality models and assessment instruments have been proposed. For instance, Livesley and Jackson's (2002) DAPP-BQ model comprises a four-factor structure that includes emotional dysregulation, dissociative behavior, inhibition, and compulsivity (van Kampen, 2002; Bagge & Trull, 2003). Markon et al. (2005) find that the DAPP-BQ, along with other instruments, can be understood in light of several hierarchical structures, with a first-order structure closely related to the α and β factors found by Digman (1997) and a five-factor structure appearing similar to the FFM. Other studies (Lynam & Widiger, 2001; Trull & Durett, 2005) use normal personality traits models, such as the FFM, to characterize and diagnose PDs. In such an approach, PDs can be considered as an extreme trait level of a normal personality dimension or as a dysfunction associated with general personality traits (Rossier et al., 2008) or a specific configuration of personality traits, such as abnormal rigidity or other maladaptive behaviors (Saulsman & Page, 2004). Widiger and Simonsen (2005) argue that because many models of PDs could be integrated in a five-dimension model similar to the FFM, these views suggest the existence of a common factor structure explaining both normal personality and PDs (Trull & Durett, 2005).

The PID-5 is a factorial structure with 25 facets that has been globally replicated in different samples (Krueger & Markon, 2014) and cultures (Rossi & De Weerd, 2013). A hierarchical structure has been identified wherein a first general factor, personality pathology, is composed of two second-order factors, internalization and externalization. The internalization factor is further divided into detachment and negative affect factors, and the externalization factor is divided into antagonism and disinhibition domains. The psychoticism domain emerges conjointly from the four other domains (Wright et al., 2012).

1.2. Links between PID-5 and FFM

Several recent studies have shown that the PID-5 dimensions are similar to the five dimensions of the FFM (Widiger & Costa, 2002; Thomas et al., 2012; Wright & Simms, 2014), suggesting that they may be a maladaptive variant of the FFM and, thus, of normal personality. For instance, Gore and Widiger (2013) conduct an SEM analysis to identify a five-factor structure in which NEO-PI-R and PID-5 dimensions loaded onto latent constructs. Specifically, agreeableness loaded negatively and antagonism loaded positively on the first dimension; neuroticism and negative affectivity both loaded positively on the second factor; extraversion loaded positively and detachment loaded negatively on the third factor; conscientiousness loaded positively and disinhibition loaded negatively on the fourth dimension; and openness and psychoticism loaded positively on the fifth dimension. This structure confirms the links observed by Leising and Zimmerman (2011), with the exception that the link between psychoticism, which includes facets measuring unusual beliefs and experiences and perceptual dysregulations, and openness, which also covers odd or unusual behaviors and cognitions, remains under debate. For instance, Watson et al. (2008) obtained separate factors for measures of openness and measures of oddity and concluded that an additional dimension for oddity is needed, along with a dimension for low extraversion, to account for the schizotypal PD variance. Meta-analyses of the relationship between the FFM and PDs (Saulsman & Page, 2004; O'Connor, 2005) find low correlations between openness and cognitive-perceptual aberrations of the

schizotypal PD. However, other studies find that when openness items are revised into more maladaptive variants, relations with schizotypal measures do emerge (Haigler & Widiger, 2001; Edmundson et al., 2011). Thus, it is concluded that more empirical research is needed to clarify the diagnostic usefulness of openness.

1.3. Links between PID-5 and PD categories

The links between the dimensions of the PID-5 and the categorical approach to PDs have been investigated, and there is substantial evidence that the PID-5 predicts well all PD categories, with each being associated with a specific profile. For instance, Hopwood et al. (2012) find that PID-5 traits explain from 38% to 56% of the variance of six of the DSM-5 diagnostic categories, namely, schizotypal, antisocial, borderline, narcissistic, avoidant, and obsessive-compulsive. Few et al. (2013) find that clinicians' ratings of the PID-5 traits explain from 33% to 69% of the DSM-IV PD constructs. These results point in the same direction as those reported previously by Morey et al. (2011), who used item-response theory analyses to examine the impairments associated with the DSM-IV PDs.

1.4. Purpose of this study

The aim of this research is to contribute to the study of the underlying structure of the PID-5. Particularly, we compared the alternative dimensional model in regards to both personality disorder categories and normal personality dimensions. Considering prior findings, we expected that the structure underlying the PID-5 and the NEO-FFI-R shared certain similarities and that the PID-5 could explain all ten PD categories as measured by the IPDE. Thus, these overlaps are further analyzed using Multiple Factorial Analysis, Principal Axis Factor Analysis, and bootstrap multiple regressions.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

A sample of 537 participants (351 women, 65.4%, and 186 men, 34.6%, aged between 17 and 89 years, $M_{\text{age}} = 32.40$, $SD = 15.04$) from a community-based sample of French-speaking regions in Switzerland completed the PID-5 and the IPDE. From among this sample, 273 respondents (175 women, 64.1%, and 98 men, 35.9% with a $M_{\text{age}} = 31.65$, $SD = 15.64$) also completed the NEO-FFI-R. All subjects were recruited from the community by psychology students as part of an assignment, and all voluntarily participated in the study. This study complied with the ethical code of the Swiss Society for Psychology.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Personality inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger et al., 2012)

The French version of the PID-5 (Roskam et al., 2015) contains 220 items divided into 25 facets and is hierarchically organized under five maladaptive personality factors that are identified as negative affectivity, detachment, antagonism, disinhibition, and psychoticism. People were asked to rate each item on a 4-point scale ranging from totally untrue to totally true according to the similarity between the actions described by the items and their own usual behaviors. Internal consistency coefficients in this study were high: negative affectivity: $\alpha = 0.91$; detachment: $\alpha = 0.93$; antagonism: $\alpha = 0.93$; disinhibition: $\alpha = 0.88$; and psychoticism: $\alpha = 0.93$.

2.2.2. Screening questionnaire of the International Personality Disorder Examination (IPDE; Loranger et al., 1999)

The French version of this screening questionnaire that assesses the ten PDs of the DSM-IV, now the DSM-5, was used (Rigozzi et al., 2009).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5035474>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5035474>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)