1 A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several Five-Factor models

Lewis R. Goldberg
University of Oregon and Oregon Research Institute, USA

This chapter is a plea for help in changing the way that we construct new measures of personality characteristics. Because I am going to propose a somewhat radical alternative to conventional practice, those who are satisfied with the pace of progress in the technology of personality assessment may not be pleased with my arguments.

In my view, however, the science of personality assessment has progressed at a dismally slow pace since the first personality inventories were developed over 75 years ago. What is usually taken to be the earliest personality instrument, Woodworth's Personal Data Sheet (PDS), was published in 1917, and since that time thousands of other instruments have been developed. Like the PDS, most of these have been of limited bandwidth, typically providing measures of one, two, or at most three traits. Virtually all of these *narrow-bandwidth* instruments are in the public domain--the items and their scoring keys having been published in scientific books, journal articles, or student theses or dissertations. The items are freely used by other scientists, either in their original form or quite commonly in some customized format. Examples of attributes measured by such narrow-bandwidth instruments include Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment, Conservatism, Coronary-Risk, Dogmatism, Empathy, Extraversion-Introversion, Guilt, Hostility, Locus of Control, Masculinity and/or/versus Femininity, Narcissism, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, Optimism, Private and Public Self-Consciousness, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Self-Disclosure, Self-Esteem, Self-Monitoring, Sensation-Seeking, Test-Anxiety, and Trust.

On the other hand, most *broad-bandwidth* personality inventories (like the MMPI, CPI, 16PF, and NEO-PI) are proprietary instruments, whose items are copyrighted by the test authors. As a consequence, the instruments cannot be used freely by other scientists, who thus cannot contribute to their further development and refinement. Indeed, broad-bandwidth inventories are rarely revised. At most, after many decades of commercial use, some of the most dated items might be changed and/or new norms established. For many inventories, nothing is ever done at all.

Personality Psychology in Europe. Vol.7. Edited by I. Mervielde, I. J. Deary, F. De Fruyt, and F. Ostendorf. pp. 7-28.

The manuals for some of these commercial inventories include tables of correlations between the scale scores and various criterion indices. But, such empirical findings are rarely used to actually influence scale development, much less to continually improve the quality of the scales. Even worse, virtually all of the findings from different inventories are incommensurate. Test authors are not encouraged to conduct *comparative* validity studies, pitting their instrument against one or more others as predictors of the same set of criterion indices. As a result, neither the science of personality assessment nor its applied practitioners have any information about the *comparative* performance of the different instruments available in the marketplace. There is no Consumers Union for testing our tests.

One basic problem is that scientific goals may become subjugated to commercial interests. I believe that it is time for a change: I envisage an international effort to develop and continually refine a broad-bandwidth personality inventory, whose items are in the public domain, and whose scales can be used for both scientific and commercial purposes. No one investigator alone has access to many diverse criterion settings; but the international scientific community has such access, and by pooling our findings we should be able to devise instruments over the next decade that make our present ones seem like ancient relics.

To get there, we need to start somewhere. To begin, we must agree on the solutions to at least three problems: (1) We need a *taxonomic framework* for organizing the nearly infinite variety of individual differences that might be measured. (2) We need a common *item format*, one that is amenable to faithful translation across diverse languages. And, (3) We need a *mode of communication* --an effective logistical procedure for investigators to easily obtain the items and the findings from previous studies, as well as the data for re-analyses; in addition, we need a way for investigators to add new items to the pool, along with findings about their properties. For the first time, the solutions to all three problems may now be at hand.

A FRAMEWORK FOR ORGANIZING PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES

While the technology of personality assessment has remained stagnant over the last decades, the fundamental taxonomic problem in personality assessment may be close to a solution. In spite of strong denials by some vocal critics (e.g., Block, 1995), I think that most investigators would agree that the general framework for a comprehensive structure of phenotypic personality attributes seems finally to be visible (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1981, 1993b, 1995; John, 1990; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996b). In a variety of Indo-European and other languages, analyses of large samples of trait-descriptive adjectives have generally led to a structural representation--often referred to as the Big-Five factor structure--which seems to

incorporate most phenotypic personality attributes (Goldberg, 1990; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996a).

One way of viewing this model is as a hierarchical structure with the Big-Five factors at or near the top of the hierarchy, below which are located the various lower-level "facets" that are measured by particular narrow-bandwidth personality measures (Goldberg, 1993a). Although there is some agreement in the personality literature about the characteristics of the higher-level factors, there is no such agreement about an optimal set of lower-level facets. For example, there are 45 bipolar dimensions in the AB5C model of the Big Five proposed by Hofstee, De Raad, and Goldberg (1992); there are 30 bipolar dimensions in the Five-Factor model of Costa and McCrae as operationalized in their revised NEO inventory (NEO-PI-R); there are about 30 to 35 facets implied in the scales in Gough's California Psychological Inventory (CPI); and there are the well-known 16 primary factors in the hierarchical structure incorporated by Cattell in his Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF). *Because agreement has not yet been reached on the relative superiority of any one of these competing lower-level structures, it behooves us to incorporate them all in our preliminary inventory, so that they can be compared empirically.*

Although an inventory that includes a systematic set of lower-level facets can easily generate the higher-level Big-Five factors, the reverse is not true. Inventories that incorporate only five dimensions can not provide the specific variance associated with each of the lower-level facets. Because most of the variance in our instruments is specific to each particular trait, inventories that measure only the Big Five will necessarily be less useful than more comprehensive ones in most applied contexts. Indeed, the optimum number of variables to include in regression analyses of individual differences is limited only by considerations of statistical power, and thus of sample size. Recent empirical "demonstrations" of this psychometric principle by Mershon and Gorsuch (1988) and by Ashton, Jackson, Paunonen, Helmes, and Rothstein (1995) are hardly needed, unless one assumes that the only reliable variance in personality measures is that common variance associated with the Big-Five factors.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON ITEM FORMAT

One major source of the Big-Five factor structure has been findings from analyses based on the "Lexical Hypothesis"--namely that the most important ways that individuals differ from each other will eventually come to be encoded as single attribute-descriptive terms (e.g., trait adjectives and type nouns) in the lexicons of the world's languages. Although the use of such single terms is necessary for the establishment of an indigenous structure in each new language

under study, these descriptors are not ideal for use as the items in multi-scale personality inventories. There are at least three interrelated problems with their use: (1) First of all, the same property that provides their major strength in fundamental taxonomic studies, namely their relatively finite number within any language, necessarily limits their utility as purveyors of the complex nuances of lower-level personality description; said another way, there are not enough of them--certainly not enough for redundant and thus reliable measurement in all regions of personality space. (2) In addition, trait adjectives and type nouns encode personality traits at an extremely high level of abstractness. Although research by Hampson, John, and Goldberg (1986) demonstrates substantial differences in breadth within the total set of English trait adjectives (e.g., Extraverted versus Talkative, or Reliable versus Punctual), even the most narrow of such terms (e.g., Talkative and Punctual) are still quite abstract. Most test authors prefer items that are more behaviorally and/or contextually specified. (3) Perhaps as a consequence of the abstractness of trait adjectives and type nouns, it is often not possible to find one-to-one translations for them in different languages, even languages as close linguistically as Dutch, German, and English (Hofstee, Kiers, De Raad, Goldberg, & Ostendorf, 1997). Given the desirability of international collaboration in the development of new assessment methods, this is a highly undesirable feature of their use as test stimuli.

Instead, I propose that we begin this project using an item format that is more contextualized and thus longer than trait adjectives, yet is more compact and thus shorter than the items in many modern personality inventories. The Groningen personality team of Hofstee, De Raad, and Hendriks have been the major proponents of this item format, and they have used it to develop an initial pool of 1,311 Dutch items which they hoped might cover many of the facets of the Big-Five factor structure; findings from analyses of 914 of these Dutch items can be found in Hendriks (1997). I worked with the Groningen team to translate most of these items into their English equivalents. From this initial English item pool, I selected about 750 in their original translations, and then added about 500 new English items that have as yet no Dutch translations[1].

The resulting pool of 1,252 English items--which I have dubbed the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)--has now been administered in three parts to

[1] Of the initial 1,311 Dutch items, about 70% were written to measure the most highly filled facets of the AB5C structure based on Dutch trait adjectives, an additional 10% were derived from Dutch personality-related verbs, and a final 20% were written to represent various facets of the Intellect domain; the 1,311 items were reduced to 914 on the basis of ratings of their Difficulty, Observability, and Social Desirability, as well as their ease of translation into English (Hendriks, 1997). Most of the approximately 500 new English items were targeted at the weakest (least highly filled) facets of the AB5C structure based on an initial set of IPIP items.

participants in an adult community sample[2]. Participants in this sample have also been administered an inventory of 360 trait-descriptive adjectives, which include 100 unipolar markers of the Big-Five factor structure (Goldberg, 1992), as well as an inventory of 525 of the most familiar person-descriptive adjectives in English. In addition, these participants have completed a variety of commercial personality inventories, including the NEO-PI-R, CPI, TCI, HPI, and the 16PF.

A MODE OF COMMUNICATION AMONG INVESTIGATORS

If scientists world-wide are to participate together to construct the next generation of personality inventories, they need an effective method for obtaining previous findings and data, and for adding their own new findings and data. With the rapid development of the World-Wide-Web (WWW) and the associated expansion of File Transfer Protocol (FTP) sites, it is now possible to access scientific data banks easily and economically through electronic means. Indeed, it is my prediction that over the next few years the phrase "public domain" will come to mean "accessible via the World-Wide-Web." To start this process, I have set up a WWW site (http://ipip.ori.org/ipip/), which includes the tables in this chapter, so as to provide easy access to this information from computer terminals throughout the world.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOME PRELIMINARY IPIP SCALES

Table 1 presents some of the characteristics of preliminary IPIP scales targeted at the 45 bipolar *AB5C* facets. For each of these new scales, Table 1 lists the number of items keyed positively, the number keyed negatively, and the total number of items in the scale; in addition, the mean item intercorrelation is provided, along with the Coefficient Alpha reliability estimate. My aspiration is to develop roughly 10-item scales, with Alphas that range from .70 to .90, and average .80. Of the 45 preliminary scales, 43 have Alphas of .70 or above, and 18 have reliabilities of .80 or above; the mean of all 45 scales is .78. The items included in each of the 45 preliminary AB5C scales are listed in the Appendix.

---

[2] The sample initially included approximately 500 men and 500 women, aged 18 to 85, recruited from the Eugene-Springfield [Oregon, USA] community, all of whom had agreed to work with the ORI personality team for at least five years; participants are periodically mailed questionnaires and inventories, which they are paid to complete. Over the four years since the sample was initially selected, approximately 20% of the participants have discontinued their participation; as a consequence, the number of participants for any single survey instrument (other than the first) varies from around 500 to around 800.

TABLE

companion

Table 1. Characteristics of the 45 preliminary IPIP scales targeted at the AB5C facets

AB5C facet	Provisional label	No. of items +	No. of items -	Mean item r	Coef. Alpha
Factor I					
I+/I+ vs. I-/I-	Gregariousness	4	6	.34	.83
I+/II+ vs. I-/II-	Friendliness	5	5	.37	.85
I+/III+ vs. I-/III-	Assertiveness	9	3	.20	.75
I+/IV+ vs. I-/IV-	Poise	5	5	.31	.82
I+/V+ vs. I-/V-	Leadership	5	5	.31	.82
I+/II- vs. I-/II+[1]	Provocativeness	8	3	.19	.72
I+/III- vs. I-/III+	Self-Disclosure	8	2	.26	.78
I+/IV- vs. I-/IV+	Talkativeness	8	2	.35	.84
I+/V- vs. I-/V+[1]	Sociability	3	7	.16	.66
Factor II					
II+/II+ vs. II-/II-	Understanding	5	5	.30	.81
II+/I+ vs. II-/I-	Warmth	9	2	.33	.84
II+/III+ vs. II-/III-[1]	Morality	5	7	.18	.73
II+/IV+ vs. II-/IV-	Pleasantness	6	6	.22	.76
II+/V+ vs. II-/V-[1]	Empathy	5	4	.20	.70
II+/I- vs. II-/I+[1]	Cooperation	2	10	.18	.73
II+/III- vs. II-/III+[1]	Sympathy	6	6	.20	.74
II+/IV- vs. II-/IV+[1]	Tenderness	9	4	.18	.74
II+/V- vs. II-/V+	Nurturance	6	7	.16	.71
Factor III					
III+/III+ vs. III-/III-	Conscientiousness	6	7	.19	.75
III+/I+ vs. III-/I-	Efficiency	5	6	.30	.83
III+/II+ vs. III-/II-[1]	Dutifulness	6	7	.21	.78
III+/IV+ vs. III-/IV-	Purposefulness	5	7	.27	.81
III+/V+ vs. III-/V-	Organization	9	3	.23	.78
III+/I- vs. III-/I+[1]	Cautiousness	5	7	.21	.77
III+/II- vs. III-/II+[1]	Rationality	8	6	.13	.67
III+/IV- vs. III-/IV+	Perfectionism	7	2	.26	.76
III+/V- vs. III-/V+	Orderliness	7	3	.27	.78
Factor IV					
IV+/IV+ vs. IV-/IV-	Stability	5	5	.37	.86
IV+/I+ vs. IV-/I-	Happiness	5	5	.34	.84
IV+/II+ vs. IV-/II-	Calmness	4	6	.33	.83
IV+/III+ vs. IV-/III-	Moderation	4	6	.24	.76
IV+/V+ vs. IV-/V-	Toughness	4	8	.29	.84
IV+/I- vs. IV-/I+	Impulse Control	2	9	.24	.78
IV+/II- vs. IV-/II+	Imperturbability	2	7	.37	.84
IV+/III- vs. IV-/III+[1]	Cool-headedness	0	10	.21	.73
IV+/V- vs. IV-/V+[1]	Tranquillity	7	4	.22	.76
Factor V					
V+/V+ vs. V-/V-	Intellect	6	5	.27	.81
V+/I+ vs. V-I-	Ingenuity	6	3	.37	.84
V+/II+ vs. V-/II-[1]	Reflection	8	2	.26	.75
V+/III+ vs. V-/III-[1]	Competence	8	0	.26	.74
V+/IV+ vs. V-/IV-	Quickness	7	3	.37	.84
V+/I- vs. V-/I+[1]	Introspection	10	2	.18	.71
V+/II- vs. V-/II+	Creativity	5	5	.30	.81
V+/III- vs. V-/III+	Imagination	5	5	.27	.78
V+/IV- vs. V-/IV+[1]	Depth	7	2	.27	.77
Mean				.26	.78

Note. All analyses are based on the responses of 501 adult subjects from the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample.

[1] These scales have been augmented with items from other AB5C facets.

Table 2 provides a comparison between some characteristics of the 30 facet scales from the *NEO-PI-R* (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and 30 similar constructs measured in the IPIP pool. Of the two sets of 30 constructs, only 13 are labeled identically; differences in scale labels are most pronounced in the Openness domain, where all six facets have different labels. On average, the IPIP scales include 10 items, with about half keyed in each direction. The average of the Coefficient Alpha values is a bit higher for the IPIP scales (.80) than for the NEO scales (.75). The average correlation between corresponding scales in the two sets is .73, which translates into a correlation of .94 when corrected for attenuation due to the unreliabilities of the two scales in each pair.

Table 3 presents a comparison between the scales on the *16PF* (Conn & Rieke, 1994) and 16 new IPIP scales constructed to measure the same constructs; the scales are ordered by their associations with the Big-Five factor structure. All but one of the IPIP scales include 10 items, about half keyed in each direction; of the 16PF scales, which are also balanced in their keying, nine include 10 items, five include 11 items, and one each includes 14 and 15 items. Cattell has preferred labeling his scales with letters (A through Q4), but the manual also lists the short verbal labels presented in Table 3; only two of these trait labels are the same as those of the corresponding IPIP scales. Because the average item intercorrelations are slightly higher for the IPIP than for the 16PF scales (.29 versus .21), the average IPIP Coefficient Alpha is also somewhat higher (.80 versus .74). The average correlation between corresponding scales in the two sets is .66, which translates into a corrected correlation of .86.

An analogous table focused on the lower-level constructs in Cloninger's Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) is available from the author. Of the 31 TCI constructs, 30 are included in the corresponding IPIP scale set--11 with Coefficient Alpha reliability estimates of .80 or more, 15 others with reliabilities of .70 or more, and 4 others with reliabilities just slightly below .70. The average Alpha values of the two sets of scales are quite similar (.77 and .78); on average, the pairs of scales correlated .64, which corresponds to a correlation of .83 when corrected for the scale reliabilities.

Also available from the author is a similar table comparing 33 of the scales in the *CPI* (Gough, 1996) with the corresponding 33 preliminary IPIP scales targeted at those constructs. The original 33 CPI scales vary in length from 28 to 70 items, averaging 38; in contrast, the IPIP scales include about 10 items, usually with half keyed in each direction. The IPIP scales are far more homogeneous than the CPI scales, with mean item intercorrelations that average .26, as compared to a mere .08 for the CPI scales. As a consequence, although the IPIP scales are much shorter than the CPI scales, both sets of scales have similar Alpha coefficients; for the original CPI scales the Alphas vary from .53 to .88, averaging .74, whereas for the IPIP scales the values range from .62 to .87, averaging .76. The

Table 2. A comparison between the 30 facet scales in Costa and McCrae's NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and the corresponding 30 preliminary IPIP scales

Scale names	Scale names	No. of items				Mean item r		Coef. Alpha		Correlation	
IPIP	NEO	IPIP		NEO		IPIP	NEO	IPIP	NEO	IPIP vs. NEO	
		+	-	+	-						
Neuroticism											
Anxiety	Anxiety (N1)	5	5	4	4	.32	.37	.83	.83	.75	[.90]
Anger	Angry Hostility (N2)	5	5	5	3	.42	.34	.88	.80	.76	[.91]
Depression	Depression (N3)	7	3	6	2	.43	.41	.88	.85	.80	[.92]
Self-consciousness	Self-Consciousness (N4)	6	4	5	3	.28	.26	.80	.74	.72	[.94]
Immoderation	Impulsiveness (N5)	5	5	4	4	.25	.24	.77	.72	.73	[.98]
Vulnerability	Vulnerability (N6)	5	5	3	5	.32	.35	.82	.79	.77	[.96]
Extraversion											
Friendliness	Warmth (E1)	5	5	6	2	.41	.33	.87	.80	.76	[.91]
Gregariousness	Gregariousness (E2)	5	5	4	4	.28	.34	.79	.80	.78	[.98]
Assertiveness	Assertiveness (E3)	5	5	4	4	.34	.33	.84	.80	.81	[.99]
Activity-level	Activity (E4)	5	5	5	3	.19	.25	.71	.72	.70	[.98]
Excitement-seeking	Excitement-Seeking (E5)	8	2	6	2	.28	.19	.78	.64	.67	[.95]
Cheerfulness	Positive Emotions (E6)	8	2	4	4	.30	.36	.81	.81	.77	[.95]
Openness to Experience											
Imagination	Fantasy (O1)	6	4	3	5	.32	.35	.83	.82	.74	[.90]
Artistic interests	Aesthetics (O2)	5	5	5	3	.36	.40	.84	.84	.80	[.95]
Emotionality	Feelings (O3)	5	5	5	3	.29	.28	.81	.75	.70	[.90]
Adventurousness	Actions (O4)	4	6	3	5	.24	.18	.77	.64	.71	[.99]
Intellect	Ideas (O5)	5	5	5	3	.38	.38	.86	.82	.80	[.95]
Liberalism	Values (O6)	3	7	3	5	.38	.30	.86	.78	.70	[.86]

Table 2 (cont.)

Scale names	Scale names	No. of items				Mean item r		Coef. Alpha		Correlation	
IPIP	NEO	IPIP		NEO		IPIP	NEO	IPIP	NEO	IPIP vs. NEO	
		+	-	+	-						
Agreeableness											
Trust	Trust (A1)	6	4	5	3	.32	.42	.82	.84	.79	[.95]
Morality	Straightforwardness (A2)	2	8	3	5	.25	.26	.75	.74	.64	[.86]
Altruism	Altruism (A3)	5	5	5	3	.25	.26	.77	.72	.67	[.90]
Cooperation	Compliance (A4)	3	7	3	5	.22	.26	.73	.73	.71	[.97]
Modesty	Modesty (A5)	4	6	4	4	.25	.27	.77	.75	.72	[.95]
Sympathy	Tender-Mindedness (A6)	4	6	6	2	.23	.17	.75	.61	.61	[.90]
Conscientiousness											
Self-efficacy	Competence (C1)	6	4	5	3	.27	.25	.78	.70	.66	[.89]
Orderliness	Order (C2)	5	5	3	5	.33	.28	.82	.74	.77	[.99]
Dutifulness	Dutifulness (C3)	5	5	6	2	.20	.23	.71	.67	.60	[.87]
Achievement-striving	Achievement Striving (C4)	7	3	5	3	.27	.21	.78	.67	.70	[.97]
Self-discipline	Self-Discipline (C5)	5	5	4	4	.36	.34	.85	.80	.76	[.92]
Cautiousness	Deliberation (C6)	3	7	5	3	.24	.23	.76	.70	.69	[.95]
Mean		5	5	4	4	.30	.29	.80	.75	.73	[.94]

Note. All analyses are based on the responses of 501 adult subjects from the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample.
[ ] Values in brackets are the correlations between the corresponding NEO and IPIP scales when corrected for attenuation due to scale unreliability.

Table 3. A comparison between the scales in Cattell's 16 Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF) and the corresponding 16 preliminary IPIP scales

Scale names	Scale names	No. of items			Mean item r		Coef. Alpha		Correlation	
IPIP	16PF	IPIP +	IPIP -	16PF	IPIP	16PF	IPIP	16PF	IPIP vs. 16PF	
Factor I										
Friendliness	Social Boldness (Factor H)	7	3	11	.30	.19	.80	.72	.64	[.84]
Openness	Privateness, reflected (N)	5	5	10	.39	.28	.86	.80	.74	[.89]
Assertiveness	Dominance (E)	6	4	10	.30	.18	.81	.68	.67	[.90]
Gregariousness	Liveliness (F)	6	4	10	.27	.18	.78	.69	.68	[.93]
Sociability	Self-reliance, reflected (Q2)	3	7	10	.22	.24	.73	.76	.64	[.86]
Factor II										
Warmth	Warmth (A)	7	3	11	.30	.19	.80	.72	.64	[.84]
Sensitivity	Sensitivity (I)	5	5	11	.22	.24	.73	.78	.68	[.93]
Factor III										
Orderliness	Perfectionism (Q3)	5	5	10	.31	.22	.81	.74	.77	[.99]
Dutifulness	Rule-Consciousness (G)	6	4	11	.35	.22	.84	.75	.69	[.87]
Factor IV										
Security	Emotional Stability (C)	5	5	10	.37	.25	.85	.76	.75	[.93]
Self-esteem	Apprehension, reflected (O)	3	7	10	.29	.24	.80	.76	.72	[.92]
Calmness	Tension, reflected (Q4)	3	7	10	.24	.24	.76	.76	.59	[.78]
Trust	Vigilance, reflected (L)	4	6	10	.29	.21	.80	.73	.57	[.75]
Factor V										
Complexity	Openness to Change (Q1)	5	5	14	.32	.17	.82	.74	.69	[.89]
Intellect	Reasoning (B)	8	5	15	.20	.15	.76	.73	.51	[.69]
Imagination	Abstractedness (M)	7	3	11	.28	.23	.80	.76	.65	[.83]
Mean		5	5	11	.29	.21	.80	.74	.66	[.86]

Note. All analyses are based on the responses of 501 adult subjects from the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample.
[ ] Values in brackets are the correlations between the corresponding 16PF and IPIP scales when corrected for scale unreliability.

average correlation between the corresponding CPI and IPIP scales is .62, which translates into a corrected correlation of .84.

Table 4 provides a summary of the reliability estimates for the five sets of preliminary IPIP scales, plus a comparison with the original 16PF, CPI, TCI, and NEO scales. Given the large size of this subject sample, one would not expect much attenuation of the IPIP reliabilities in new samples[3]. As a consequence, the most reasonable conclusion one can make from these findings is that the average reliability coefficients for the four sets of preliminary IPIP scales are quite similar, and all of them are at least as high as the values for the average NEO, CPI, TCI, and 16PF scales. Hopefully, with the help of other investigators, even more reliable IPIP scales will become available over the next decade.

Table 4. The mean reliabilities of the preliminary IPIP scales targeted at the AB5C, NEO, CPI, TCI, and 16PF facets, and a comparison with the original inventory scales

	Mean of the mean item correlations		Mean Coefficient Alpha		Mean correlation
	IPIP	Original	IPIP	Original	IPIP vs. original
AB5C	.26	—	.78	—	— —
NEO	.30	.29	.80	.75	.73 [.94]
CPI	.26	.08	.76	.74	.62 [.84]
TCI	.28	.34	.77	.78	.64 [.83]
16PF	.29	.21	.80	.74	.66 [.86]

Note. Most of the IPIP scales include 10 items; all of the NEO scales include 8 items, the average CPI scale includes 38 items, the average TCI scale includes 8 items, and the average 16PF scale includes 11 items. All analyses are based on the responses of 501 adult subjects from the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample.
IPIP = International Personality Item Pool.
[ ] Values in brackets are the correlations between the corresponding scales when corrected for attenuation due to scale unreliability.

[3] Although generally one should expect lower reliabilities in new samples than in the initial derivation sample, this may not occur for the IPIP scales, given that the IPIP items were administered in three separate questionnaires over a period of nearly three years. One of the first tasks for future investigators must be to test the robustness of these scales in new samples.

A FIRST COMPARATIVE VALIDITY STUDY

Most of us would agree that the single most important question to be asked of new personality measures concerns their utility as predictors of diverse and important human outcomes. Given the great scientific interest of late in behavioral medicine and health psychology, I used as initial criterion variables some indices of health-related behaviors and practices. A factor analysis of the 39 items in a reasonably comprehensive Health Activities Questionnaire (HAQ: Vickers, Conway, & Hervig, 1990) yielded three orthogonal factors: (1) *Risk-Avoidance* (12 questions such as "I carefully obey traffic rules," "I do not drink," "I avoid high-crime areas" versus "I take chances crossing the street," "I speed while driving," "I drive after drinking"); (2) *Good Health Practices* (12 items such as "I exercise to stay healthy," "I eat a balanced diet," "I see a dentist for regular checkups," "I watch my weight," "I don't smoke"); and (3) *General Health Concerns* (15 items such as "I gather information on things that affect my health," "I avoid areas with high pollution," "I take health food supplements", "I watch for possible signs of major health problems").

The orthogonal factor scores on each of these three health factors were used as criterion variables, along with the factor scores on the first unrotated component from an analysis of all 39 HAQ items (*Total Health-Related Practices*). In stepwise regression analyses, the scores from each of the five IPIP preliminary scale sets and each of the four original 16PF, CPI, TCI, and NEO scale sets were included separately as the predictor variables. To control for any effects of subject sex, age, and educational level, all of the analyses were repeated using two additional procedures: (a) Using hierarchical regression procedures, the three demographic variables were entered first, followed by the personality scale scores, and (b) the residual factor scores from the HAQ were included as criterion variables after the effects of the three demographic variables were partialed out.

The validity findings are easy to summarize: At each step in the regression analyses, for each of the four criterion variables, and for each of the three types of regression procedures, the preliminary IPIP scale sets were typically more highly predictive than the original inventory scale sets. Of the four criteria, the most predictable were Risk Avoidance and Total Health-Related Practices, and for these two criteria the IPIP scales were always more predictive than the original inventory scales. For example, in the standard regression analyses predicting Risk Avoidance from the TCI and corresponding IPIP scale sets, the multiple correlations at each of the first four steps, for the TCI scales versus the IPIP scales were: (1) .42/.57; (2) .49/.63; (3) .52/.64; and (4) .54/.65. The corresponding values for predicting the same criterion using hierarchical regression analyses were (1) .49/.60; (2) .54/.65; (3) .55/.66; and (4) .57/.67.

In summary, then, the initial evidence regarding the reliability and predictive utility of the preliminary IPIP scales is quite favorable. With the help of other investigators throughout the world, we should be able to refine these scales, and develop new ones, so as to provide substantially improved measures of important personality attributes. As a reader of this chapter, will you join me in this scientific adventure?

Acknowledgements

This research program has been funded by Grant MH-49227 from the National Institute of Mental Health, U. S. Public Health Service. The author is enormously indebted to Willem K. B. Hofstee, Boele De Raad, and Jolijn Hendriks for their development of the initial Dutch item pool from which many of the IPIP items were translated.

References

Ashton, M. C., Jackson, D. N., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Rothstein, M. G. (1995). The criterion validity of broad factor scales versus specific facet scales. *Journal of Research in Personality, 29*, 432-442.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 187-215.

Conn, S. R., & Rieke, M. L. (1994). *The 16PF fifth edition technical manual.* Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

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.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology: Vol. 41* (pp. 417-440). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Vol. 2* (pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "Description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1216-1229.

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

Goldberg, L. R. (1993a). The structure of personality traits: Vertical and horizontal aspects. In D. C. Funder, R. D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasey, & K. Widaman (Eds.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development* (pp. 169-188). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993b). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*, 26-34.

Goldberg, L. R. (1995). What the hell took so long? Donald Fiske and the Big-Five factor structure. In P. E. Shrout & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Personality research, methods, and theory: A Festschrift honoring Donald W. Fiske* (pp. 29-43). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gough, H. G. (1996). *CPI Manual: Third Edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hampson, S. E., John, O. P., & Goldberg, L. R. (1986). Category breadth and hierarchical structure in personality: Studies of asymmetries in judgments of trait implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 37-54.

Hendriks, A. A. J. (1997). *The construction of the Five-Factor Personality Inventory (FFPI)*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Hofstee, W. K. B., De Raad, B., & Goldberg, L. R. (1992). Integration of the Big-Five and circumplex approaches to trait structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 146-163.

Hofstee, W. K. B., Kiers, H. A. L., De Raad, B., Goldberg, L. R., & Ostendorf, F. (1997). Comparison of Big-Five structures of personality traits in Dutch, English, and German. *European Journal of Personality, 11*, 15-31.

John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford.

Mershon, B., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1988). Number of factors in the personality sphere: Does increase in factors increase predictability of real-life criteria? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 675-680.

Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (1996a). Evidence for the Big Five in analyses of familiar English personality adjectives. *European Journal of Personality, 10*, 61-77.

Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (1996b). The language of personality: Lexical perspectives on the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 21-50). New York: Guilford.

Vickers, R. R., Jr., Conway, T. L., & Hervig, L. K. (1990). Demonstration of replicable dimensions of health behaviors. *Preventive Medicine, 19*, 377-401.

Scale item scoring key prelim

Appendix. The 45 preliminary scales for the AB5C Facets

Facet	Label	Alpha	Facet	Label	Alpha
I+/I+ vs I-/I-	**Gregariousness**	**(.83)**	**I+/IV+ vs I-/IV-**	**Poise**	**(.82)**
Am the life of the party.			Feel comfortable around people.		
Talk to a lot of different people at parties.			Am comfortable in unfamiliar situations.		
Start conversations.			Have a lot of fun.		
Love large parties.			Am not embarrassed easily.		
			Love life.		
Don't talk a lot.			Often feel uncomfortable around others.		
Keep in the background.			Find it difficult to approach others.		
Am quiet around strangers.			Retreat from others.		
Don't like to draw attention to myself.			Give up easily.		
Bottle up my feelings.			Only feel comfortable with friends.		
Keep my thoughts to myself.					
I+/II+ vs I-/II-	**Friendliness**	**(.85)**	**I+/V+ vs I-/V-**	**Leadership**	**(.82)**
Make friends easily.			Take charge.		
Am open about my feelings.			Know how to captivate people.		
Act comfortably with others.			Express myself easily.		
Radiate joy.			Am the first to act.		
Warm up quickly to others.			Never at a loss for words.		
Am hard to get to know.			Have little to say.		
Am a very private person.			Have difficulty expressing my feelings.		
Avoid contacts with others.			Wait for others to lead the way.		
Keep others at a distance.			Am afraid to draw attention to myself.		
Reveal little about myself.			Let others make the decisions.		
I+/III+ vs I-/III-	**Assertiveness**	**(.75)**	**I+/II- vs I-/II+**	**Provocativeness**	**(.72)**
Automatically take charge.			Dare to say anything.		
Can easily push myself forward.			Am not afraid of providing criticism.		
Try to lead others.			Boast about my virtues.		
Turn plans into actions.			[Know no limits.]		
Stick up for myself.			[Know how to get around the rules.]		
Am always busy.			[Can take strong measures.]		
Come up with a solution right away.			[Don't mind being the center of attention.]		
Do a lot in my spare time.			[Make demands on others.]		
Know what I want.					
Let myself be pushed around.			Can't stand confrontations.		
Am not highly motivated to succeed.			Wait for my turn.		
Need a lot of time to do things.			[Hate to seem pushy.]		

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha
I+/III- vs I-/III+	**Self-Disclosure**	**(.78)**
Act wild and crazy.		
Am open about myself to others.		
Let myself go.		
Disclose my intimate thoughts.		
Laugh my way through life.		
Express childlike joy.		
Joke around a lot.		
Like to amuse others.		
Seldom joke around.		
Prefer to deal with strangers in a formal manner.		
I+/IV- vs I-/IV+	**Talkativeness**	**(.84)**
Do most of the talking.		
Talk too much.		
Speak loudly.		
Make myself the center of attention.		
Like to attract attention.		
Never stop talking.		
Make a lot of noise.		
Demand to be the center of interest.		
Speak softly.		
Dislike talking about myself.		
I+/V- vs I-/V+	**Sociability**	**(.66)**
Can't do without the company of others.		
[Enjoy being part of a loud crowd.]		
[Enjoy being on the go.]		
Like to be alone.		
Seek quiet.		
Enjoy silence.		
[Don't like crowded events.]		
[Dislike neighbors living too close.]		
[Amuse myself easily.]		
[Go my own way.]		
II+/II+ vs II-/II-	**Understanding**	**(.81)**
Sympathize with others' feelings.		
Respect others' feelings.		
Take others' interests into account.		
Like to be of service to others.		
Appreciate the viewpoints of others.		
Feel little concern for others.		
Am not interested in other people's problems.		
Am indifferent to the feelings of others.		
Take no time for others.		
Can't be bothered with others' needs.		
II+/I+ vs II-/I-	**Warmth**	**(.84)**
Am interested in people.		
Make people feel at ease.		
Know how to comfort others.		
Inquire about others' well-being.		
Take time out for others.		
Make people feel welcome.		
Show my gratitude.		
Make others feel good.		
Feel others' emotions.		
Am not really interested in others.		
Rarely smile.		
II+/III+ vs II-/III-	**Morality**	**(.73)**
Would never cheat on my taxes.		
Respect the privacy of others.		
Like harmony in my life.		
[Try to follow the rules.]		
[Respect authority.]		
Don't care about rules.		
Turn my back on others.		
Only talk about my own interests.		
Overestimate my achievements.		
Scheme against others.		
[Act at the expense of others.]		
[Break rules.]		

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha
II+/IV+ vs II-/IV- Pleasantness		**(.76)**
Am easy to satisfy.		
Trust what people say.		
Have a good word for everyone.		
Am on good terms with nearly everyone.		
Trust others.		
Respect others.		
Am hard to satisfy.		
Am quick to judge others.		
Insult people.		
Find it hard to forgive others.		
Contradict others.		
Criticize others' shortcomings.		
II+/V+ vs II-/V- Empathy		**(.70)**
Anticipate the needs of others.		
Sense others' wishes.		
[Love to reflect on things.]		
[Try to stay in touch with myself.]		
[Work on improving myself.]		
Pretend to be concerned for others.		
[Don't have a soft side.]		
[Treat people as inferiors.]		
[Am not in touch with my feelings.]		
II+/I- vs II-/I+	**Cooperation**	**(.73)**
Value cooperation over competition.		
Listen to my conscience.		
Impose my will on others.		
Love a good fight.		
Seek conflict.		
Think too highly of myself.		
Tell tall stories about myself.		
Play tricks on others.		
Enjoy crude jokes.		
[Comment loudly about others.]		
[Enjoy being reckless.]		
[Do dangerous things.]		
II+/III- vs II-/III+	**Sympathy**	**(.74)**
Am concerned about others.		
Am deeply moved by others' misfortunes.		
Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself.		
[Take an interest in other people's lives.]		
[Like to do things for others.]		
[Reassure others.]		
Demand a lot from others.		
Don't fall for sob-stories.		
Listen to my brain rather than my heart.		
Tend to dislike soft-hearted people.		
Try not to think about the needy.		
Look down on any weakness.		
Believe people should fend for themselves.		
II+/IV- vs II-/IV+	**Tenderness**	**(.74)**
Suffer from others' sorrows.		
Listen to my heart rather than my brain.		
Love children's movies.		
Want to please others.		
Remember my friends' birthdays.		
Want to mean something to others.		
Cherish mementos.		
[Believe crying helps me feel better.]		
[Show my feelings.]		
Don't understand people who get emotional.		
[Don't get excited about things.]		
[Don't call people just to talk.]		
[Don't care about dressing nicely.]		
II+/V- vs II-/V+	**Nurturance**	**(.71)**
Have a soft heart.		
Go out of my way for others.		
Think of others first.		
Will do anything for others.		
Like to please others.		
Wouldn't harm a fly.		
Make enemies.		
Oppose authority.		
Believe that I am better than others.		
Seek danger.		
Put people under pressure.		
Try to outdo others.		
Believe only in myself.		

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha

III+/III+ vs III-/III- Conscientiousness (.75)

Accomplish my work on time.
Do things according to a plan.
Am careful to avoid making mistakes.
Keep my checkbook balanced.
Like to plan ahead.
Return borrowed items.

Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
Neglect my duties.
Take tasks too lightly.
Leave my work undone.
Do not plan ahead.
Put off unpleasant tasks.
Am often late to work.

III+/I+ vs III-/I- Efficiency (.83)

Am exacting in my work.
Make plans and stick to them.
Get chores done right away.
Follow through with my plans.
Finish what I start.

Waste my time.
Find it difficult to get down to work.
Postpone decisions.
Have difficulty starting tasks.
Need a push to get started.
Frequently forget to do things.

III+/II+ vs III-/II- Dutifulness (.78)

Follow directions.
Keep myself well-groomed.
Check over my work.
Behave properly.
[Stick to the rules.]
[Appreciate good manners.]

Do improper things.
Disregard rules.
Do the opposite of what is asked.
Pay no attention to my appearance.
[Don't think laws apply to me.]
[Make rash decisions.]
[Say inappropriate things.]

III+/IV+ vs III-/IV- Purposefulness (.81)

Am always prepared.
Carry out my plans.
Get to work at once.
Am not easily distracted.
Handle tasks smoothly.

Make a mess of things.
Am easily distracted.
Mess things up.
Shirk my duties.
Don't see things through.
Do things at the last minute.
Can't make up my mind.

III+/V+ vs III-/V- Organization (.78)

Pay attention to details.
Complete tasks successfully.
Have an eye for detail.
Demand quality.
Set high standards for myself and others.
Make well-considered decisions.
Follow through on my commitments.
Detect mistakes.
Think ahead.

Seldom notice details.
Put little time and effort into my work.
Don't pay attention.

III+/I- vs III-/I+ Cautiousness (.77)

Purchase only practical things.
Tend to dislike impulsive people.
Take precautions.
[Never splurge.]
[Never spend more than I can afford.]

Do crazy things.
Often make last-minute plans.
Am easily talked into doing silly things.
Laugh at the slightest provocation.
Like to laugh out loud.
[Like to act on a whim.]
[Jump into things without thinking.]

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha	Facet	Label	Alpha
III+/II- vs III-/II+	**Rationality**	**(.67)**	**IV+/IV+ vs IV-/IV-**	**Stability**	**(.86)**
Do things in a logical order.			Seldom get mad.		
Come straight to the point.			Am not easily bothered by things.		
Believe in a logical answer for everything.			Am not easily frustrated.		
Get a head start on others.			Seldom take offense.		
Dislike imperfect work.			Keep my cool.		
Believe in an eye for an eye.			Get stressed out easily.		
[Have no sympathy for criminals.]			Get upset easily.		
[Reason logically.]			Am easily disturbed.		
Sympathize with the homeless.			Change my mood a lot.		
Am not as strict as I should be.			Get caught up in my problems.		
Let people pull my leg.					
[Do things in a half-way manner.]					
[Let my attention wander off.]					
[Believe that criminals should receive help rather than punishment.]					
III+/IV- vs III-/IV+	**Perfectionism**	**(.76)**	**IV+/I+ vs IV-/I-**	**Happiness**	**(.84)**
Continue until everything is perfect.			Seldom feel blue.		
Want every detail taken care of.			Feel comfortable with myself.		
Want everything to be "just right."			Adapt easily to new situations.		
Want things to proceed according to plan.			Look at the bright side of life.		
Demand perfection in others.			Am sure of my ground.		
Keep a sharp eye on others' work.			Often feel blue.		
Expect dedicated work from others.			Worry about things.		
Am not bothered by messy people.			Feel threatened easily.		
Am not bothered by disorder.			Dislike myself.		
			Am filled with doubts about things.		
III+/V- vs III-/V+	**Orderliness**	**(.78)**	**IV+/II+ vs IV-/II-**	**Calmness**	**(.83)**
Like order.			Rarely get irritated.		
Follow a schedule.			Am not easily annoyed.		
Work according to a routine.			Take things as they come.		
Like to tidy up.			Accept people as they are.		
Do things by the book.			Get angry easily.		
Take good care of my belongings.			Am often in a bad mood.		
See that rules are observed.			Get furious.		
Leave my belongings around.			Snap at people.		
Leave a mess in my room.			Lose my temper.		
Dislike routine.			Have days when I'm mad at the world.		

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha	Facet	Label	Alpha

IV+/III+ vs IV-/III- Moderation (.76)

Remain calm under pressure.
Easily resist temptations.
Rarely overindulge.
Am able to control my cravings.

Am guided by my moods.
Am not sure where my life is going.
Don't know why I do some of the things I do.
Get out of control.
Can't concentrate.
Do things I later regret.

IV+/V+ vs IV-/V- Toughness (.84)

Am calm even in tense situations.
Don't lose my head.
Know how to cope.
Can stand criticism.

Take offense easily.
Panic easily.
Am easily hurt.
Am easily offended.
Feel crushed by setbacks.
Become overwhelmed by events.
Am easily frightened.
Am easily confused.

IV+/I- vs IV-/I+ Impulse Control (.78)

Keep my emotions under control.
Let others finish what they are saying.

Demand attention.
React intensely.
Talk even when I know I shouldn't.
Often make a fuss.
Shoot my mouth off.
Am easily excited.
Blurt out whatever comes into my mind.
Barge in on conversations.
Like to gossip.

IV+/II- vs IV-/II+ Imperturbability (.84)

Seldom get emotional.
Am not easily affected by my emotions.

Get overwhelmed by emotions.
Cry easily.
Burst into tears.
Am easily moved to tears.
Cry during movies.
Wear my heart on my sleeve.
Have crying fits.

IV+/III- vs IV-/III+ Cool-headedness (.73)

(No positive items.)

Want everything to add up perfectly.
Demand obedience.
Place demands on myself.
Keep up an appearance.
[Love order and regularity.]
[Am attached to conventional ways.]
[Want things done my way.]
[Am a creature of habit.]
[Try to impress others.]
[Can't stand being contradicted.]
[Want to be told I am right.]

IV+/V- vs IV-/V+ Tranquility (.76)

Experience very few emotional highs and lows.
Tend to feel the same every day.
Am always in the same mood.
Rarely notice my emotional reactions.
[Am relaxed most of the time.]
[Am not easily stirred.]
[Am not disturbed by events.]

Experience my emotions intensely.
[Have frequent mood swings.]
[Am swayed by my emotions.]
[Can be stirred up easily.]

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha
V+/V+ vs V-/V-	**Intellect**	**(.81)**
Have a rich vocabulary.		
Use difficult words.		
Make insightful remarks.		
Show a mastery of language.		
Enjoy thinking about things.		
Try to understand myself.		
Am not interested in abstract ideas.		
Will not probe deeply into a subject.		
Have a poor vocabulary.		
Dislike learning.		
Skip difficult words while reading.		
V+/I+ vs V-/I-	**Ingenuity**	**(.84)**
Am full of ideas.		
Have excellent ideas.		
Carry the conversation to a higher level.		
Come up with bold plans.		
Quickly think up new ideas.		
Am good at many things.		
Do not have a good imagination.		
Have difficulty imagining things.		
Can't come up with new ideas.		
V+/II+ vs V-/II-	**Reflection**	**(.75)**
See beauty in things that others might not notice.		
Take time to reflect on things.		
Make beautiful things.		
Enjoy discussing movies and books with others.		
Enjoy the beauty of nature.		
[Like music.]		
[Love flowers.]		
[Love beautiful things.]		
Do not like concerts.		
[Do not enjoy watching dance performances.]		
V+/III+ vs V-/III-	**Competence**	**(.74)**
Learn quickly.		
Use my brain.		
Excel in what I do.		
Look at the facts.		
Meet challenges.		
Seek explanations of things.		
Need things explained only once.		
[Know how to apply my knowledge.]		
(No negative items.)		
V+/IV+ vs V-/IV-	**Quickness**	**(.84)**
Can handle complex problems.		
Am quick to understand things.		
Catch on to things quickly.		
Love to read challenging material.		
Am able to find out things by myself.		
Can handle a lot of information.		
Quickly get the idea of things.		
Avoid difficult reading material.		
Try to avoid complex people.		
Don't understand things.		
V+/I- vs V-/I+	**Introspection**	**(.71)**
Spend time reflecting on things.		
Enjoy spending time by myself.		
Live in a world of my own.		
Enjoy my privacy.		
Don't mind eating alone.		
Do things at my own pace.		
[Enjoy contemplation.]		
[Prefer to be alone.]		
[Have a point of view all my own.]		
[Want to be left alone.]		
Can't stand being alone.		
Don't like to ponder over things.		

Appendix (cont.)

Facet	Label	Alpha
V+/II- vs V-/II+	**Creativity**	**(.81)**

Like to solve complex problems.
Ask questions that nobody else does.
Know the answers to many questions.
Challenge others' points of view.
Can easily link facts together.

Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.
Avoid philosophical discussions.
Am not interested in theoretical discussions.
Consider myself an average person.
Am not interested in speculating about things.

V+/III- vs V-/III+ Imagination (.78)

Have a vivid imagination.
Prefer variety to routine.
Believe in the importance of art.
Need a creative outlet.
Enjoy wild flights of fantasy.

Do not like art.
Do not enjoy going to art museums.
Do not like poetry.
Seldom get lost in thought.
Seldom daydream.

V+/IV- vs V-/IV+ Depth (.77)

Look for hidden meanings in things.
Like to get lost in thought.
Think deeply about things.
Need to understand my motives.
[Tend to analyze things.]
[Tend to think about something for hours.]
[Enjoy examining myself and my life.]

[Rarely look for a deeper meaning in things.]
[Never challenge things.]

Note. The IPIP items were administered with the following response options: (1) Very inaccurate, (2) Moderately inaccurate, (3) Neither inaccurate nor accurate, (4) Moderately accurate, and (5) Very accurate. Values in parentheses are Coefficient Alpha reliability estimates.

[ ] Items in brackets come from other AB5C facets.