Personality traits across cultures
A Timothy Church

Current questions in the study of personality traits across cultures include (a) the universality versus cultural uniqueness of trait structure, (b) cultural differences in trait levels, (c) the consistency and validity of traits and their measures across cultures, and (d) the evolutionary, ecological, and cultural contexts of personality. Although the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality continues to find cross-cultural support, new research suggests that the model may be difficult to replicate in less educated or preliterate groups and that indigenous social–relational concepts may be distinguishable from the FFM in some cultures. In lexical studies, two or three broad dimensions may replicate better across cultures than alternative models. Substantial evidence suggests that mean trait profiles of cultures may be reasonably accurate. Nonetheless, research on response styles and measurement invariance raises questions about cross-cultural trait comparisons. Findings regarding cultural differences in trait-related consistency and validity are mixed. Researchers are offering innovative theory and research on the evolutionary, ecological, and cultural contexts of personality.

Address
Department of Educational Leadership, Sport Studies, and Educational/ Counseling Psychology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-2136, United States

Corresponding author: Church, A Timothy (church@mail.wsu.edu, church@wsu.edu)

Introduction
Current questions in the study of personality traits across cultures include (a) the universality versus cultural uniqueness of trait structure, (b) cultural differences in trait levels, (c) trait consistency and validity, and (d) the evolutionary, ecological, and cultural contexts of personality. Trait theorists expect similar trait structure, moderate behavioral consistency, and the ability of traits to predict important outcomes in all cultures [1]. By contrast, cultural psychologists anticipate greater cultural differences in the structure, consistency, and validity of traits [2]. Previous work is summarized in key reviews [1,3●,4]. The present article highlights recent work.

Trait structure
Researchers investigate the universality versus cultural uniqueness of trait structure by transporting measures across cultures, identifying indigenous dimensions, or a combination of these approaches. These approaches correspond to the *etic/emic* distinction in cross-cultural psychology [5]. The terms derive from the distinction in linguistics between phon*etics* (the study of *universal* sounds in all languages) and phon*emics* (the study of the *unique* or language-specific meanings associated with particular sounds) [6].

Imposed-etic studies. In the *imposed-etic* strategy, researchers transport existing personality models or measures into new cultural contexts to test their universality or cross-cultural equivalence [5]. Much of this work has tested the universality of the Five Factor of 'Big Five' Model — comprised of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism), and Openness to Experience/Intellect dimensions [7]. Good replication of the model was demonstrated in educated French-speaking African samples [8], but studies of the Mooré in Burkina Faso [9] and forager-farmers in Bolivia [10●●] highlight the difficulty of replicating the Big Five in less educated or preliterate groups. Inventories that measure dimensions that differ somewhat from the Big Five also exhibit good replication across cultures [11], which suggests that transported measures impose their structures to some extent. Finally, how traits are organized within individuals (i.e., personality types) is also important for understanding individuality. In a cluster analysis of Big Five scores, Resilient, Overcontrolled, and Undercontrolled types were replicated across four cultures [12].

Emic (indigenous) studies. In emic approaches, researchers draw on indigenous sources such as native languages and cultural informants to identify culture-specific personality constructs. In the lexical approach, ratings for a representative set of trait terms in a language are factor analyzed to identify indigenous dimensions. Table 1 shows sample terms in a hierarchy of prominent lexical models.

Lexical studies in Western European languages — and a recent study in Polish [13] — support the generalizability of Big Two, Big Three, Big Five and Big Six models. However, in Hindi, three large dimensions recalled the indigenous triguna system rather than the usual Big

Table 1

Sample trait terms in a hierarchy of lexical models.

Big One[a]

Diligent, generous, honest, careful, good, happy, kind, patient, responsible, active, brave, conscientious, disciplined, friendly, gentle, helpful, humane, polite versus lazy, selfish, egocentric, envious, greedy, sad, stingy

Big Two[a]
Social Self-Regulation

Honest, kind, generous, gentle, obedient, respectful, diligent, responsible, calm, careful, patient, polite, conscientious, courteous, dutiful, good-natured, humane, industrious, thoughtful versus selfish, egocentric, envious, gossipy, hot-headed, rebellious
Dynamism

Active, brave, bold, lively, daring, dynamic, strong, clever, courageous, enterprising, extraverted, intelligent, talkative, vigorous versus timid, weak, shy, cowardly, fearful, pessimistic, sad, silent, anxious, depressed, dull, introverted, melancholy, taciturn, troubled

Big Three[b]
Affiliation

Humane, good-natured, compassionate, kind, gentle, nice, warm, understanding, helpful, sympathetic, affectionate, caring versus aggressive, revengeful, arrogant, selfish, authoritarian, quarrelsome, ruthless, egocentric
Dynamism

Extraverted, vivacious, talkative, lively sociable, dynamic, cheerful, enterprising, vigorous, unrestrained, energetic, self-confident, active, enthusiastic, spontaneous versus timid, insecure, inhibited, pessimistic, reserved, passive, quiet, sad, introverted, silent
Order

Goal-oriented, self-disciplined, systematic, precise, thorough, stable, organized, responsible, determined, hard-working, logical, rationale, industrious, capable, efficient versus forgetful, frivolous, impractical, inefficient, irresponsible, inconsistent, erratic, hasty

Big Five[c]
Extraversion/Surgency

Extraverted, talkative, assertive, energetic, bold, active, vigorous versus introverted, shy, quiet, reserved, inhibited, timid, bashful
Agreeableness

Kind, cooperative, sympathetic, warm, agreeable, helpful, generous versus cold, distrustful, harsh, demanding, rude, selfish, uncooperative
Conscientiousness

Organized, systematic, thorough, neat, efficient, conscientious, prompt versus disorganized, careless, inefficient, undependable, negligent, inconsistent, sloppy
Emotional stability (vs. *Neuroticism*)

Relaxed, imperturbable versus anxious, moody, envious, irritable, jealous, touchy, insecure, fearful
Intellect

Intellectual, creative, imaginative, bright, artistic, innovative versus unsophisticated, uninquisitive, shallow, simple

Big Six[d]
Extraversion

Extraverted, cheerful, exuberant, enthusiastic, lively, sociable, talkative, vivacious versus quiet, shy, introverted, reserved, silent, lonely
Agreeableness

Gentle, patient, peaceful, serene, calm, tolerant, forgiving, accommodating versus aggressive, irritable, touchy, quarrelsome, hot-tempered, belligerent, stubborn
Conscientiousness

Conscientious, purposeful, dutiful, industrious, systematic, thorough, responsible, orderly versus disorganized, neglectful, irresponsible, lazy, negligent, absent-minded, disorderly
Emotionality

Resolute, assured, courageous, fearless, decisive, imperturbable, self-confident, stable versus fragile, emotional, vulnerable, insecure, sensitive, fearful, anxious, timid
Intellect

Intelligent, talented, knowledgeable, original, intellectual, artistic, creative versus unimaginative, uneducated, ignorant, unsophisticated
Honesty-Humility

Honest, sincere, truthful, loyal, humane, just, fair, altruistic, generous, understanding, helpful versus boastful, conceited, greedy, calculating, egotistical, smug, pompous

[a] See Ref. [16[••]].
[b] Selected from Table 6 in Ref. [17[••]].
[c] Selected from Table 3 in Ref. [72].
[d] Selected from Table 8 in Ref. [17[••]].

Three [14]. Saucier and colleagues [15] culled all terms that can describe a human from the dictionaries of 12 languages (e.g., Wik-Mungkan, Maa, Hopi) selected to be diverse in geographical and cultural context. Only 28 of these human-attribute terms were shared (i.e., had the same English translation) across all of the languages and 41 additional terms were identified in 11 of the languages.

The shared terms provided best support for the universality of morality (e.g., disobedient, evil, love) and competence (e.g., useless, stupid, wise) attributes. Indeed, lexical studies comparing multiple languages have begun to question how well trait models of more than two [16[••]] or three [17[••]] dimensions replicate across languages.