Introducing Personality

“With no positivity, there is no hope; with no negativity, there is no improvement.”

—Criss Jami (b. 1987), American poet
Learning Objectives

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

• Define personality and explain the personality concept in psychology
• Describe the four major types of knowledge relevant to the study of personality
• Identify ways to apply knowledge about personality psychology in specific professional settings

What matters most to you and why? Every year, a top U.S. graduate business school asks its applicants this question. If you were one of the applicants—and you very well might be someday—how would you answer? Remember, only one in 20 applicants will be admitted, and you want to be one of them. How would you describe who you are in the best way?

What matters to you most? Of course, the economy, the violence in the world, and the future of the planet. Maybe the people who are becoming more detached from one another while constantly staring at their smartphones. More online connections, fewer eye contacts. Of course, you can list the things that should matter to you as a good citizen, yet will they be a reflection of the true you? One side of you is always about I should; the other is about I am. Which side would you emphasize in the application? And what if what matters most to you today is different tomorrow?

Maybe it will be better instead of global issues to focus on the personal ones: your worries and insecurities . . . after all, the business school wants to learn about you. But wait a minute! The school probably is not interested in studying your problems. It wants to see how you solved them. And speaking of the world, you probably think that you should offer the boldest, most original solutions. Yet what if that reveals your naiveté and immaturity? Maybe it is better to stay realistic and pragmatic.

Now suddenly you realize how little you know about yourself. You feel disappointed for a moment. What if you are like everybody else, no different from others? Then you realize that there hasn’t been anyone exactly like you in the past. There is nobody exactly like you anywhere now. There won’t be anyone exactly like you in the future.
And then you clearly understand that perhaps what matters most to you is all about the ability to continue the endless search for the things that matter. Let this book be a helper in this journey. It may also help with your next application.

**Identifying Personality**

Defining *personality* is one of the most challenging tasks in psychology. Psychologists often view personality according to their main theoretical positions held within the discipline. So if this is the case, what should we do? No matter how diverse the views of personality are, we need to have an initial point of reference. A working definition of *personality* is a stable set of behavioral and experiential characteristics of an individual (American Psychological Association [APA], 2014). We should also understand that this definition isn’t carved in stone: During our learning journey, we will have more than ample opportunity to reexamine and clarify this initial definition. But it should help in starting the discussion of personality theories and their applications.

**Explaining the Definition and Asking Questions**

Details are important. To make sure that we are on the same page, consider the following questions and answers about the personality definition and its interpretations.

**Q.** Which characteristics of an individual do psychologists associate with personality?
**A.** The American Psychological Association refers to patterns of *thinking, feeling, and behaving* (APA, 2014). Similarly, our working definition suggests *behavior* and *experience* (experience in psychology traditionally refers to thinking and feeling).

**Q.** Do we need to study every behavioral act and every moment of experience?
**A.** Of course not. We are looking only at relatively *stable* patterns and *enduring* features of behavior and experience. These features manifest in various life situations. Psychologists try to describe, measure, compare, and explain such patterns. Later we will turn to the study of personality *traits* as distinct and stable patterns of behavior and experience (Chapter 7 specifically focuses on traits).

**Q.** Does every individual have a personality?
**A.** It is logical to assume that personality has to be associated with, or remains inseparable from, a certain material or physical carrier, such as a human body. However, in many parts of the book and particularly in Chapter 8 (on the cognitive tradition) we will discuss whether personality can be viewed and understood independently from such a carrier.
Q. Do stones, bridges, paper bags, or atomic particles have personalities? What about machines? They display distinct characteristics, features, and patterns.

A. Probably not. Personality—let’s get back to the definition—refers to behavior and feelings. Bridges and paper bags do not feel. At least most psychologists think so. We can assign certain personality features to these and other objects (or literary figures), but these will be the imaginative features based on comparisons of objects to humans.

Q. But do pets have personalities? Cats and dogs can feel.

A. This is an intriguing question to which we will turn in Chapters 6 and 8. For the sake of certainty, let’s accept for now that personality is something related to human beings (we will call them persons, individuals, people, women, men, intersex, and so on) as carriers of personality features. But we will not ignore the questions about machines and pets and whether they have personality.

Q. Do our personalities “exist” after we die?

A. This is a difficult question. We remember people who are no longer with us; very often, we keep memories of their personalities. Furthermore, there is physical evidence associated with such personalities. Randal Munroe, who hosts the famous www.xkcd website, predicts that when you read this there are more than 20 million people with Facebook profiles who have already died. On their pages, we can see the pictures of smiling, acting, and living individuals chitchatting about their lives and the world. Their profiles are there but the hosts aren’t. In Chapter 6, Chapter 9, and Chapter 10 we will discuss the meaning of individual immortality.

Q. Can a human being have two or more personalities?

A. Probably yes. Clinicians in the United States recognize dissociative identity disorder (known as “multiple personality disorder”). But some psychologists disagree. Although there have been probably thousands of individuals who have claimed to have or experience several personalities, their self-reported symptoms are often disputed. We will examine personality from the mental illness perspective in Chapter 12.

Q. Is there another personality or personalities exactly like yours?

A. Probably yes and maybe no. It depends how we interpret “exactly” and how many personality features we compare. But if we look at just a few features of you, we can suggest that a person with similar features may be located very near you. Just look around.

Three Principles Explaining Personality

Although personality is largely a theoretical concept, it is also very important in psychological practice at least for three reasons.
The first one has to do with consistency. The personality concept helps psychologists establish consistency in the individual's observable qualities and characteristics; based on that, they make predictions regarding the person's behavior. For example, consider a client who is never late for her appointments with a therapist, who writes down questions before each therapeutic session, and who meticulously follows each one of the therapist's recommendations. Most likely, this person will exhibit similar patterns of behavior in the future therapeutic sessions.

The second reason is about the practical value of the personality concept, or the causation of behavior. Personality is a concept indicating that an individual's behavior, feelings, or thoughts are not just direct responses to various outside influences. These behaviors, feelings, or thoughts are, to a degree, originated from within: We know that some people tend to be more secretive, open-minded, or aggressive than others. Personality features, for that reason, appear as an underlying force, influencing a person's interactions with the social environment. Some of these features can be very powerful causes of behavior, whereas others are only weak ones. For example, openness to experience, as a personality trait, may result in extremely promiscuous and dangerous behavior in one individual; although in another one, openness to experience may cause many helping, generous, and unselfish acts.

The third reason has to do with organization. People display thousands of seemingly unrelated characteristics. The systemic approach that has been used in psychological studies of personality helps psychologists delineate a few salient qualities of an individual, which are supposed to relate to one another. In a way, these qualities can represent a “summary” for what the individual is. Some characteristics are essential, central to the person. For example, five characteristics—neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience—have been found by many researchers to be the “core” or the most salient traits and were named the Big Five (Costa & McCrae, 1985). The more central the quality is, the better it describes the essence if the individual's personality, the more it distinguishes this person from other people, and the more accurate it is in predicting the person's behavior.

Each of the central traits influences other, secondary, less essential (peripheral) characteristics, which, in turn, affect a set of relatively stable behaviors, or habits (see Figure 1.1).
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Personality’s Dichotomies

In many ways, personality can be described as a coexistence of at least two conditions that are opposite to each other. They are called opposites, or dichotomies. However, because they coexist, they are dependent on each other. As an example, the categories big or kind cannot exist unless there are categories such as small or mean. In other words, the opposite is necessary for the existence of the other, and one manifests together with the other. Let’s further explain this in the following illustrations. We will use examples from history, most recent research in psychology, and our daily experiences.

Personality Is Unique and Typical

Andy Warhol was and remains one of the most fascinating artists ever and especially of the 20th century. He stood out because of his unique art, but he was also outstanding because of his personality (see Photo 1.1). Many who knew him claimed that his personality—a pattern of his actions, ideas, and emotional expressions—was unquestionably one of a kind. Warhol maintained the unique ability to surprise, shock, and inspire—all at the same time. He had his mother sign his artwork. He asked other people to impersonate him on a lecture tour. One of his gifts was his ability to combine the incompatible just to see what happened: He made movies of objects that never moved and used actors who could not act at all, and he made art out of boxes and cans that did not look like art (Menand, 2010). His personality was a bundle of energy, destined to shock and impress. And yet this type of behavior, this pattern of thinking, feeling, and acting is not necessarily unique! His behavior and experiences exhibited a particular type of personality that, in theory and practically, can be found in other people; someone’s apparent uniqueness can by typical. Warhol belongs to a type of individuals who are predictable in their unpredictability. There are many other people who think and act in a similar way. Being “typical” is about combining or exhibiting the essential characteristics of a number of other people.

We are similar to many other people because we share related genetic characteristics with them. We are also subject to comparable physical and environmental factors, such as geographic location or persistent weather patterns. Circumstances we all experience together may “produce” similar behavioral and emotional features, such as persistent despair, pride, or aggressiveness; however, none of these factors influences us in isolation (Astuti & Bloch, 2010), as we will see in Chapter 2. Sure, we shouldn’t expect a 100% match of all personality features between any two individuals—even so-called identical twins are not necessarily identical.
since during their mother's pregnancy, they have different placement in the womb and receive different quantities of nutrition and exposure to hormones (Segal, 2012)—but we all are different and similar to a certain degree.

Let us briefly summarize the topic of our uniqueness. Our personality features are unique, and as distinguishable displays or patterns of behavior and experience, they will be called personality traits. As strokes of a pencil or coal on a piece of paper define the important features of a portrait, traits help in defining personality (the term trait comes from the Latin tractus, which means “a stroke”). Taken together in a combination, our traits form a certain type. Type refers to a kind or category of elements or features sharing similar characteristics or qualities. Individuals thus displaying similar combinations of traits may be considered as belonging to the same type. We, as individuals, are unique. However, our apparent uniqueness can be typical.

**Personality Features Can Be Central and Peripheral**

Do you think of yourself as an optimist, pessimist, or somewhere in between? Are you pessimistic in some situations and optimistic in others? Or are you optimistic most of the time? Some personality features are central because they tend to be somewhat wide-ranging and present—to various degrees—in most people, most of the time. Consider, for example, openness to experience, which includes a combination of imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, attentiveness to inner feelings, preference for variety, and intellectual curiosity. Peripheral personality features tend to be more specific and also tend to appear in particular individuals in specific individual or cultural circumstances. Also consider, for example, sensitivity to honor, which is a tendency to react aggressively to actual or imaginable insults. Central features are not necessarily more important than peripheral, and the differences between them are not clear-cut.

Let's talk further about pessimism—a persistent, broad-spectrum belief in and anticipation of undesirable, negative, or damaging outcomes. Pessimism can be a central feature. It can be prevalent in some individuals (Do you know some of them?) but not in others. Pessimism, however, may manifest in a range of peripheral features. One person with a strong propensity for pessimism may display persistent sadness or constant lack of initiative or chronic lack of self-discipline, which may affect individual performance. Research shows that such individuals are less likely to be successful in job searches compared to optimists with similar skills (Kaniel, Massey, & Robinson, 2017).
Yet another person with a propensity for pessimism may display a very different pattern: He or she is always prepared for undesirable, bad outcomes and thus practices self-discipline to avoid them. Studies show, in fact, that pessimism encourages some people to live more carefully by taking serious health and safety precautions (Lang, Weiss, Gerstorf, & Wagner, 2013). Pessimism as a central feature or trait in yet another person may manifest as a secondary trait in the form of **cynicism**, which is persistent distrust of other people's motives. People prone to cynicism tend to question others' good intentions and believe that such intentions and actions are not altruistic but rather selfish. People who tend to be pessimistic are not necessarily cynical; however, a person who tends to be cynical is likely to be pessimistic. A cynical person does not have to be prone to sadness or display a lack of self-discipline.

As we will see later in other chapters, the interactions between central and peripheral traits tend to be extremely complex. At times they can seem puzzling. Research helps clarify the interaction between central and peripheral personality features (see Figure 1.2). For example, people have been shown to have a general tendency to **self-enhance**, or deem our self as superior to peers (in other words, we tend to believe that we are somewhat better, smarter, and more reasonable than others). Self-enhancement can be understood as a central trait. However, studies show that people in Western cultures (Western Europe and North America) tend to self-enhance differently than people in East Asian cultures. Westerners are likely to self-enhance on traits relevant to individualism (being ambitious, decisive, etc.) and Easterners tend to self-enhance more on attributes relevant to collectivism, such as duty, responsibility, and the like (Gaertner, Sedikides, Cai, & Brown, 2010). Some central personality features may be determined largely by biological factors, as research suggests, which may also affect their relative universality and constancy. Peripheral traits may appear as adjustments to specific social circumstances and can be associated with an individual's lifestyle. These peripheral features often change without affecting central features (McCrae & Costa, 1999). Imagine a woman who has been shy and withdrawn in her childhood as feeling uncomfortable being among new people. In college, however, she grows increasingly comfortable when interacting with many fellow students. Yet still, in most situations outside the campus, she remains largely shy and withdrawn.

**Personality Is Stable and Evolving**

*A Christmas Carol* is a masterpiece by the great English writer Charles Dickens. Its main character is Ebenezer Scrooge, whose personality is distinctively set early in the novella. He is consistent: He is mean, greedy, rude, cold, and full of envy. He is impolite to others, unhelpful, and lacks empathy. On Christmas Eve, Scrooge undergoes a miraculous and sweeping psychological transformation. After three spirits visit him at night and reveal to him how unhappy and meaningless his life is,
he wakes up a different man. He suddenly turns into a kind, compassionate, generous, and caring individual. He dramatically changes his patterns of behavior and thought! Though Scrooge is a character in a fairy tale, you may find many examples of people who almost suddenly and swiftly change their behaviors, their beliefs, and even their lifestyles. Change is part of our lives. Yet some changes take place faster than others, and some people experience them more often than others. Some tend not to change.

Stability is part of our lives as well. Research shows that people are inclined to challenge logic and math only to remain loyal to their stable, deep-seated values (Kahan, 2012). Do you know of people who have preserved their main habits for years? Some of them avoid any form of confrontation. Others constantly seek action, conflict, and new conflicts. Some others prefer to pick the same type of a battle, like Jacques Vergès was, a well-known attorney who was always eager to defend “very bad guys.” Among his defendants, almost exclusively, were accused terrorists, gangsters, dictators, bankrupts, and thieves. He defended the Nazi war criminal Klaus Barbie and the Cambodian dictator Khieu Samphan. He was a confrontational attorney and a feisty human being; his key strategy in life and in the courtroom was to accuse the accuser and challenge the challenger. His biographers say that he learned this technique in childhood, when his father taught him to throw stones at bullies. Vergès remained in a constant war of arguments with others. Big deal, one may say—he worked for money. Not necessarily. In very many cases, he worked pro bono, for free (McFadden, 2013). And he seemingly enjoyed that constant feistiness.

Stability and change are based on many interconnected influences. Research has established that through our individual life-span we keep many of our personality characteristics relatively stable: A challenger and troublemaker is likely to retain his or her “feistiness” for a long time (McCrae & Costa, 1990). Studies also reveal that personality can change. Central features tend to change slowly, and peripheral ones may change faster. Change is susceptible to time. Most personality-related changes take place during childhood. Our personalities become more or less stable in middle age and are least changeable after we reach 50 (Roberts & Friend-DelVecchio, 2000). Adults and children as groups, for example, tend to have a different sense of humor or the propensity to laugh about certain themes because our general perceptions of what is funny when we are children differs from our perception as adults (Stanley, Lohani, & Isaacowitz, 2014).

In light of this research, should we assume that the transformation that has taken place in Scrooge’s personality was rather atypical because older adults are not that susceptible to sudden personality changes compared with the young? It is probably so. But remember that our personalities are unique; statistical tendencies suggesting how we should feel or react in a certain type of situation are expectations based only on probabilities. Personality is supposed to be stable, and at the same time, it is evolving because stability and change are both adaptive features. As humans, we continually adjust to a changing social and physical environment. We often learn from our mistakes. We grow wiser with age and better understand our personal boundaries (wisdom, among other things, is about knowing your own limitations). We tend to imitate other people’s successful actions. We learn about connecting certain behaviors to the
circumstances in which these behaviors occur. Some learn that being greedy is beneficial at times. Others, like Scrooge, learn kindness. Jacques Vergès was, the lawyer who loved defending notorious individuals, saw his work as rewarding, thus allowing him to fulfill his individual skills and potentials as an attorney.

Early Hindu writings (Chapter 2) from thousands of years ago suggest that some individuals are like “carvings” on a rock—their individual features are solid and long-lasting. Other people are like “prints” on the earth because their mental states pass more quickly. Yet others are compatible with marks on the water because they are extremely changeable.

**Personality Can Be Viewed as “Normal” and “Abnormal”**

Connie Picciotto (1946–2016) kept vigil near the White House for more than 30 years (see Photo 1.2). Day after day, she peacefully demonstrated there against nuclear weapons. Two large boards behind her with messages in all capital letters read “BAN ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS OR HAVE A NICE DOOMSDAY” and “LIVE BY THE BOMB, DIE BY THE BOMB.” She carried on one of the longest continuous acts of political protest in the United States: Five presidents resided in the White House since the first day of her protest. Thousands of tourists saw and photographed her there. Some stopped and talked to her. Others smirked and passed by. Why did this woman spend more than half of her adult life in front of the White House? Why did she choose such an extraordinary method of activism? Was she . . . normal?

As you might know, effective activism requires a measure of unconventionality, but when nonconventional behavior is consistent and inflexible, it can be judged as deviant (Gibson, 2013). However, don’t we all act in unconventional ways from time to time? And who is the judge?
We the people, as ultimate judges, create conventional rules to distinguish between acceptable and objectionable behavior. Moderation, modesty, honesty, and friendliness as individual traits are likely to be considered desirable and appropriate. Most people in most circumstances view them positively. In contrast, we recognize inappropriate, undesirable, or unhealthy patterns of actions and thought. We avoid, criticize, or reject them; for example, being a consistent liar is typically frowned upon. What other undesirable patterns could you name?

Notice that judgments about normal (appropriate) and abnormal (inappropriate) traits of a person vary across circumstances, generations, and cultures. For example, flashy disco clothes at a “Remember the ’70s” party would be expected, but wearing such clothes to a typical class lecture would be considered unusual and would definitely turn a few heads. Likewise, some personality traits may be seen as unusual, ambiguous, or even abnormal when you apply one set of social standards to judge them. Tolerance threshold is a measure of tolerance or intolerance toward specific personality traits in a society or within a cultural group. Tolerance thresholds can be high or low, and they are tested in specific situations. David Bowie’s eccentric behavior was largely accepted and even admired because people, and particularly millions of his followers, expected him, as a creative person, singer, and performer to act in these unusual ways. High thresholds indicate relative societal tolerance to varying personality traits, whereas low thresholds signify relative societal intolerance against specific behaviors associated with certain personality traits.

Particular personality features are defined and categorized in medical terms. Personality disorders are enduring patterns of behavior and inner experience that deviate markedly from the expectations of the individual’s culture. It is not just being different. It is a persistent behavioral pattern that leads to the individual’s distress and impairment in one or several important areas of functioning (Akhtar, 2002). Clinicians today recognize personality disorders as a special diagnostic category, and there is growing consistency in the way these disorders are diagnosed in different countries. Overall, personality disorders represent a deviation from what is considered “standard” personality in a specific social and cultural environment. We will return to this discussion in Chapter 12.

Is it accurate to assume that “what is typical is normal; what is normal is good,” and therefore, “what is not typical is abnormal; what is abnormal is bad”? Notice how, in each case, a description of what exists becomes converted into a prescription of what we like or dislike. As Scottish philosopher Hume pointed out more than 200 years ago, values, ethics, and morality are based not on logic or reason but on the sentiments and public opinions of a particular society. Thus, no description of human behavior, however accurate, can ever ordain what is “right” or “wrong” behavior (Levy, 1997). It makes no difference whether we are studying cultural customs, religious convictions, political beliefs, educational practices, recreational activities, sexual proclivities, or table manners. If most people display a particular behavior, it does not necessarily make it right; if most people do not, it does not automatically make it wrong.

**Personality Is Rooted in Nature and Nurture**

Did you ever notice how quickly U.S. presidents age right before your eyes? Passing the middle of their 4-year term in office, they look tired, their faces are wrinkled,
and their eyes signal fatigue. Their body language sends a desperate call for a long vacation. Science has established that aging is a biologically programmed mechanism. However, today’s science also shows that nonbiological factors play a significant role in how the body ages. For example, chronic stress, overeating, or an inactive lifestyle accelerates aging (Epel, 2009, 2012). And this is true for every age group, including those who are in their 20s.

The debates about complex interactions of natural (biological) and social (cultural) factors have always been the focus of attention in social sciences and psychology. The essence of the nature–nurture debate was not necessarily about the dilemma of whether it is exclusively nature or nurture that makes us who we are as persons. Some emphasized the importance of biological factors affecting human development, behavior, and experience. Others emphasized the crucial role of social factors. Later, these views merged. A century ago, psychologists began viewing human beings as products of both the natural world and the social environment (Münsterberg, 1915). The assumption about the dual impact of natural and social factors on an individual’s functioning is generally accepted today.

Consider the pseudobulbar affect, or PBA. This is a syndrome characterized by persistent, involuntary, and uncontrollable laughing and crying episodes or a combination of both. Medical research indicates these symptoms are related to neurological disease or injury, which are natural factors. Yet these natural factors affect the behavior and experiences of a living, breathing, functioning person; they have a serious impact on this individual’s social interactions, work, education, relationships, and the overall quality of life. It is common that individuals with PBA become socially withdrawn, shy, and overanxious over the years (Colamonico, Formella, & Bradley, 2012; Gordon, 2012). Why? People are aware of their symptoms, notice other people’s negative reactions, and often feel embarrassed by strangers’ remarks. Although this syndrome is a neurological condition, it may profoundly affect individuals’ social behavior, self-esteem, and the way they see other people.

The question remains open about the specific mechanisms of nature–nurture interactions. Most debates focus on the extent or degree of the impact of such factors and on the ways our knowledge can be applied to practice.

**Personality Refers to Body and Mind**

Research shows that people who are ill but remain optimistic and strongly believe that they will get healthy tend to recover somewhat better than pessimists (Bryan, Aiken, & West, 2004). This may be a fine illustration of how the optimistic mind affects the body. Or does it? Could it be that healthy people tend to be more optimistic than those who are unhealthy? Understanding the mechanisms of the mind–body interactions has been one of the most challenging topics of research and intellectual debates in the history of science and one of the most intriguing problems in psychology (Gergen, 2001).

For centuries, many scholars believed that experimental science was incapable of studying the “higher” mental processes, including values, will, or beliefs. How could one, they argued, measure compassion? Others disagreed. They believed in the possibility
of the scientific study of the mind through research on the nervous system and the brain. These opposing views stood for a global scientific and cultural divide between the two “camps” of thinkers. One often criticized the other for reducing the complexity of mental life to the movements of molecules through body fibers. The other camp, in response, accused its critics of backwardness and even ignorance (i.e., How can you not study the mind scientifically?). Even using the most advanced methods of neurophysiology and computer science, today’s researchers face a challenge in measuring the subjective elements of a person’s experience (Kurzweil, 2005). Yet they are firm in their assumptions that personality features are inseparable from our bodies. Neurophysiologists have long associated personality with the functioning of the human brain (see Chapter 2). Leading researchers refer, for instance, to the functioning of the brain stem and the hypothalamus as key brain structures that allow self-awareness, an important feature of personality (Damasio, 2012; Parvizi & Damasio, 2001).

The body and mind interact in remarkable ways. Remember the study showing that optimists who believe that they will get healthier tend to achieve more positive results than bitter pessimists? Other studies reveal that optimism and high self-esteem

**SELF-REFLECTION**

In the 2013 movie *Her*, the main character [Theodore] is a shy, bored, and frustrated man who is about to get a divorce. Driven by his loneliness, he purchases software for his computer that serves as his personal assistant. This thinking-and-talking operating system can self-advance and grow psychologically. Theodore picks a gender for the system and calls her Samantha. Gradually, as they spend many hours “together,” Theodore falls in love with Samantha (or what she represents): a kind, smart, gentle, and compassionate “being.” At one point, he becomes jealous of her for interacting with other clients who have purchased her services. The problem, of course, is that Samantha isn’t human.

This film may be labeled as scientific fiction. Yet to some, *Her* is more than sci-fi entertainment. Technology guru and futurist Ray Kurzweil has already proposed that by 2045 humans will have achieved digital immortality by uploading their minds to computers. Humans, because of digital immortality, will overcome the need for a biological body for survival. Futurists who subscribe to this idea agree and argue that advances in neural engineering and modeling of brain function will make it possible to reproduce human minds in a digital medium even earlier than we think (Kurzweil, 2005). People will be able to create virtual bodies and virtual reality in which the virtual reality will be as realistic as the actual reality (we will return to this discussion in Chapter 8).

**Questions**

Let’s assume that Kurzweil’s project is successful, and in 10 or 20 years, people are able to upload their personality features to computers. What benefits could this technological project bring to you personally? What ethical problems would you anticipate if such a project is implemented?
contribute to healthy habits (Bryan et al., 2004). An individual’s strong sense of personal control has a significant impact on health: If you believe that you are in charge of your life, you’ll stay healthier than those who are not so sure about who is in charge (Johnson & Krueger, 2005). The psychologist and popular author David Myers (2008) also found supportive evidence for the positive impact of our deep-seated positive beliefs, including love and faith, on health and behavior.

**Personality Is Active and Reactive**

Classical psychological experiments conducted in several countries showed that children from wealthier families tended to see coins as smaller than they actually were, while children from poor families overestimated the size of coins (Bruner & Goodman, 1947; Dawson, 1975). This is just a small illustration that our minds and bodies work differently when we lack something and feel it. Anyone who has a shortage of money, time, food, rest, sleep, or emotional support from others is likely to think and behave out of so-called **scarcity mindset**: a reaction to a shortage of resources. People thus concentrate more on pressing threats and necessities and reassess the value of certain things that are in short supply. The chronically lonely, as research shows, become more aware of other people’s feelings and become better interpreters of other people’s emotions. People who are short on money pay greater attention to price tags in stores. This scarcity mindset may become a useful, adaptive mechanism of acting and thinking, but it may also produce less adaptive responses. People in need tend to process less information, weakening their self-discipline, and are likely to make more logical errors than those without scarcity mindset. As such, if you are temporarily low on cash, you will likely score lower on IQ tests compared with the life periods when you have enough money (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013).

These research data seem to make sense. We respond to conditions in which we live here and now. We tend to adjust to changing circumstances. Our personality traits are formed under the complex interaction of natural and social factors. It seems plausible that personality is a “product” of circumstances, and every step we take is a response to these circumstances.

This position or view in psychology is called **determinism**: Psychological phenomena are causally determined by preceding events or some identifiable factors. In theory, the more such factors we identify, the more understandable and predictable psychological phenomena become (Kenrick, Li, & Butner, 2003). Determinism encourages personality psychologists to (1) study the factors that influence personality and its various features, (2) explain personality by referring to these factors, and (3) predict its development in the future.

Determinism faces at least two challenges. First, there are too many unknown factors affecting our behavior and experience, so we simply cannot take into consideration all of them. Second, these factors are interconnected and thus are not clearly identifiable. Psychologists generally avoid **fatalism**, which states that humans are not in control of their lives because something or somebody else predetermines or “programs” them. It can be God, fate, or chance. Psychologists today are likely to support the position called **self-determination**, which means that we, as individuals, generally are in control of our plans, actions, responses, minds, and personality features.
Approaching Personality

In a highly publicized book, *The Mirror Effect* (2009), the well-known doctor and TV personality Drew Pinsky and his colleague S. Mark Young provided an intriguing account of a personality feature known as narcissism. The authors reviewed stories of people who displayed the important signs of narcissism in their behavior and judgments (see Photo 1.3). What were those signs? In a nutshell, people labeled narcissistic were prone to vanity, which is the excessive belief in a person’s own superiority, outstanding talents, or irresistible appeal to others; persistently craved being the center of attention; believed that they were entitled to enjoy perks unavailable to other people; and were manipulative and capricious. Based on these stories, the authors made several conclusions:

- Narcissistic people are trapped between their own imagined magnificence, on the one hand, and emotional disconnection with other people, on the other.
- People, especially the young, pay too much attention to celebrity narcissists and copy their behavior; this is how many new narcissistic personalities may develop.
- Celebrities do not become narcissists; rather, most narcissists are driven to become celebrities.
- The behavior of today’s celebrities, as individuals, is much more dysfunctional than it was a decade or two ago.
- Narcissism is more prevalent today than it has ever been in human history.

CHECK AND APPLY YOUR KNOWLEDGE

1. Define personality traits. Explain central and peripheral traits. What traits do you think you have? Could you name them?
2. How does the story of Ebenezer Scrooge relate to the study of personality? Provide an example of a person who has significantly and rapidly changed his or her personality features.
3. Explain the tolerance threshold. Give an example.
4. Discuss the case of Connie Picciotto. Was her persistent behavior “normal” or “abnormal” from your standpoint?
5. Give an example of scarcity mindset. Give an example in which you or another person acted this way.
6. Explain the difference among determinism, fatalism, and self-determination—all referring to personality.
But how do Pinsky and Young make these far-reaching conclusions? How did they study these personality types? How do we know that the knowledge we are gaining from the book about narcissism—as a personality feature—is accurate and the book’s generalizations are correct? If our goal is to gain knowledge about personality, we have to pay attention to knowledge and the ways we select it.

Let’s define a few key terms first. **Knowledge** is information that has a purpose or use. We are particularly interested in knowledge related to personality. This knowledge has certainly not been finalized once and for all. It is constantly evolving. Take, for example, shyness and inhibition. Centuries ago, persistent inhibitive behavior was primarily associated with an imbalance of vital liquids in the body. Later theories of the 19th century referred to the nervous system and its weakness as the cause of shyness. Some studies in the 20th century referred to shyness as a complex reflex, while others focused on introversion, an underlying psychological layer. Yet more recent studies focused on a dynamic combination of psychological and hereditary factors as foundations of shyness. We can safely assume that today’s knowledge of shyness is evolving.

In order to gain knowledge about personality, some of us read serious psychological papers, while others browse through stories in online tabloids. Others do both. Which of these sources convey knowledge: a peer-reviewed academic journal or an online blog? Which of these two contain knowledge: a research paper on narcissistic personality or a popular book on the same subject? In fact, they all do. Knowledge remains knowledge, regardless of whether you find it interesting or boring (however, knowledge can be accurate and inaccurate). For centuries, different people and groups observed human behavior and experience, described them, and then used this knowledge to pursue their own goals. As a result, several types of psychological knowledge have emerged (see **Table 1.1**).
TABLE 1.1  Four Types of Knowledge Related to Personality: A Preview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Knowledge</th>
<th>Sources of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Knowledge accumulated through research, systematic empirical observation, and evaluation of a wide range of psychological phenomena. Facts are obtained with the help of scientific research methodologies and rigorous verification by multiple sources, typically including peer reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular (or Folk)</td>
<td>Everyday assumptions about psychological phenomena and behavior. Such assumptions are often expressed in the form of beliefs, evaluations, or prescriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>A consistent set of beliefs about the world, the nature of good and evil, right and wrong, and the purpose of human life. They are all based on a certain organizing principal or central idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Knowledge encapsulated in the law and detailed in rules and principles related to psychological functioning of individuals. Legal authorities commonly establish these rules and enforce them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four Types of Knowledge

Scientific Knowledge

The type of knowledge to which we will pay most attention in this book is scientific knowledge. Its major source is science, or systematic empirical observation, measurement, and evaluation of facts. It is rooted in the scientific method, which uses cautious research procedures designed to provide reliable and verifiable evidence (Gergen, 2001). Scientific knowledge is accumulated through research or systematic empirical observation and evaluation of a wide range of psychological phenomena. Facts should be obtained with the help of sound research methodologies, which require rigorous verification by multiple sources. However, relevance of these facts, as well as relevance of scientific knowledge, is continually changing with time (Kendler, 1999).

Supporters of scientific knowledge for centuries saw it as the exclusive arbiter of truth in the researcher’s understanding of personality. However, what was accepted as scientific and what was not varied greatly throughout history. Take the individual’s emotional side, for example. Over 2,500 years ago, the ancient Greek philosopher Democritus believed that the movement of atoms of different shape and speed stood for an individual’s various emotional states. More than 400 years ago, René Descartes, the French-born scientist, associated emotions with the activities of animal spirits passing through the vascular system. Later, according to the James–Lange theory of the late 19th century, there were bodily reactions that evoked experiences that a person then labeled as emotions. The Cannon–Bard theory of the 20th century explained emotions as signals that cause an individual’s bodily reactions. In the 1920s, the physiologist Ivan Pavlov in Russia and the psychologist John Watson in the United States studied emotions as an individual’s learned reflexes. Can you tell which of these views represented scientific knowledge and which did not?
In fact, all of them represented science. However, it was a developing science. All these theories attempted scientific yet incomplete knowledge. New theories produced new scientific knowledge. This does not make the earlier theories unscientific, but they were probably less accurate. In personality psychology, science is always a work in progress.

**Popular Beliefs**

Imagine you hear your friend saying “Short people are enthusiastic, dynamic, and ambitious because they want to compensate for their height. They make great friends for the same reason.” How does your friend know this?

Probably the most accessible type of knowledge to most people is **popular (or folk) beliefs**. They are observations and assumptions that represent a form of “everyday psychology” created by the people and for the people (folk is an old Germanic word meaning “people”). It appears that the statement about short people belongs to this category. This opinion can easily be shared with other people who, in turn, may ignore, accept, or reject it. Popular beliefs related to personality are either individual or common assumptions about certain aspects of human behavior and experience. Some of these assumptions, such as the belief in the connections between height and ambition, are very broad. Others, such as how to ask for an extension to complete a paper from a professor who appears to be in a very good mood, could be very specific. Popular beliefs are, to some degree, our working assumptions about us and other people. These assumptions can be measured and tested under particular circumstances.

Folk beliefs refer to all areas of life. Consider failure and success. Why do some people remain successful in their lives while others do not? Why do some people remain chronically poor? People have different opinions. For example, when it comes to the question of why people are poor, 46% of Americans believed that circumstances beyond one’s control were more often to blame, while 38% said an individual’s lack of effort was more to blame. Others cited both factors (Drake, 2013). As surveys show, Americans view the well-to-do type as more intelligent and more hardworking but also greedier than other types. Does your personal experience support these views?

Many popular beliefs tend to be accurate: They may be based on already existing facts or scientific research. This shouldn’t be too surprising because people, as a group, tend to be careful and meticulous observers of behavior (Lock, 1981). For instance, from our own experience and from stories told by our friends, we know that people often become desperate during a lingering period of personal failures. We also learn that we all have “bad days” from time to time and that hope is one of the greatest remedies against despair. We tend to distinguish between different kinds of popular knowledge. Some of us enjoy watching television shows about vampires, yet we do not really believe in vampires roaming around. On the other hand, a program on alcoholism may motivate some of us to talk to a relative or friend in hopes of diverting him or her from drinking.

Popular beliefs tend to be inconsistent. You may have one opinion related to interpersonal skills of tall individuals but later agree with your classmate who has a
different view. Popular beliefs can be inaccurate or simply wrong. Some people, for example, think that parental mistakes can “cause” schizophrenia in children when they enter adulthood (science is skeptical about this belief). Or take, for example, popular assumptions about “permanent harms” of teenage masturbation—in particular, the belief that masturbation causes irreversible personality problems, intellectual decline, or even blindness. Such unproven assumptions continue to significantly impact parental practices of millions of people around the globe (Laqueur, 2004).

Knowledge related to personality and designed for mass consumption is called popular psychology, or simply pop psychology. Pop psychology reaches people primarily through the media—television, radio, popular books, magazines, and the Internet. This information tends to be simple and often sensational. Although professionals who write for popular blogs and appear on television shows have advanced degrees in psychology or medicine—and many of their ideas are valuable—it takes a viewer’s effort to filter sensational ideas or unproven generalizations from facts. Therefore, we will constantly need to learn and critically review many popular beliefs related to personality as well as the applications of these beliefs.

Values

In contrast to folk beliefs, values are stable perceptions about the individual’s place and his or her role in the world. Values refer to the nature of good and evil, purpose of life, right and wrong behavior, gender roles, and so forth. Values are different from popular beliefs because they are grounded on a set of unwavering principles. Tradition and authorities often defend these principles. Values are deep-seated beliefs that do not necessarily require factual scrutiny. One person may believe in the absolute necessity of being honest all the time and everywhere. This is her value, which she practices. Another person believes that homosexuality is an abnormal trait and a type of abhorrent behavior. This belief (if it is deeply held) may also be a value. In the history of human civilization, politics played a big role in promoting certain values related to individual traits and suppressing others (Dumont, 2010). In Germany 75 to 80 years ago, the Nazi ideology blended a mixture of radical nationalism and racism that affected the entire German society. During that time, the German educational institutions and the media actively promoted the ideal personality type: men and women that are physically fit, emotionally stable, morally pure, hard working, and uncompromising against Germany’s domestic and foreign enemies. German psychologists were ordered to provide research data to help the younger generations become physically and mentally strong, to learn Nazi principles, and to defend, as brave soldiers, the German state.

Religion is one of the most powerful sources of values. People routinely use religion to explain their behavior and personality traits (Harrington, 1996). Behavioral prescriptions, such as moderation in needs, respect for strong family ties, frugality, discipline, and thrift, are common in the doctrines and practices of Christianity, Judaism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Sikhism, Islam, Buddhism, and other religions. Views of psychological illness are also affected by religious beliefs. Within the Christian tradition, as an illustration, the core beliefs related to sin, confession, and repentance
motivate many individuals to believe that some severe forms of mental illness are God’s punishment for inappropriate behavior (see Photo 1.4; Shiraev & Levy, 2013).

How significant is the impact of religious values on behavior? It depends on who you are. Some of us are religiously devout. Others are not. Some people do not practice religion, and it is not a source of values for them. Globally, about 13% of people consider themselves atheists, twice as many as the percentage in the United States. The highest number of atheists (47%) is in China; Japan has 31%. The lowest percentage (1%) of atheists is in Iraq and Afghanistan. Religiosity is higher among the poor and the less educated (Win-Gallup International, 2012). Some religious values translate into actual behavior, but others do not. Indian psychologists admit the paradoxical nature of their society in which everyday life is conducted between profound mysticism and the spiritual nature of religious values on the one hand and ordinary, pedestrian lives on the other. The worship of goddesses and the abuse of women coexist. Asceticism competes against consumerism. The profound sense of fairness is numbed by daily corruption. These scholars maintain that spirituality and religious passion have not played a crucial role in the improvement of the ordinary person (Chaudhary, 2010; Ramanujan, 1989).

Legal Knowledge

Prescriptions—including “this is allowed” or “this is not”—regulate behavior of individuals and groups. Legal knowledge emerges in official, legal prescriptions by authorities (ranging from tribal leaders to countries’ governments). Legal knowledge may agree with or may contradict popular beliefs and values. The legal definition of insanity, for instance, is different from other definitions of mental illness. Legal knowledge produces labels to place people in special categories. The labels lunatic and idiot appeared until recently in the U.S. Code (the official compilation of federal laws), referring to individuals non compos mentis (not of sound mind). Existing legal categories such as criminal or insane may automatically create expectations that those who carry these labels presumably possess mainly undesirable personal qualities, including propensity to violence, disobedience, irrationality, perversion, and other forms of deviance.
Legal definitions provide strict guidelines about an individual's social status, such as formal maturity. In the United States, an individual becomes an “adult” and gains new rights, such as being able to vote or get married, at age 18. Other legal rules define which acts of individual violence are allowed (like self-defense) and which are condemned. Legal knowledge provides explanations for right and wrong actions related to marriage and divorce, people's ability to raise children, an individual's sexual orientation, and so forth. From the legal standpoint, homosexuality was considered a pathological trait and illness in the United States for most of the past century, but in the Soviet Union before 1990, a person could end up in prison for being openly gay. In many countries today, governments continue to criminalize gays and lesbians. Legal rules establish boundaries of acceptable human behavior and affect customs and practices globally. Legal knowledge directly affects our judgments, emotions, and thoughts.

How Different Types of Knowledge Interact

What is character? Define it in one sentence. Next, ask people near you to do the same. You will receive different answers. Probably you will receive quick replies, such as “Character is one's mental strength” or more evasive answers like “Character is something everyone has.” These unrehearsed answers will probably reflect these respondents' popular knowledge. Other answers may be more sophisticated. Some people may refer to literary characters. Others will associate character with moral values. Some will cite definitions from academic books. You can imagine how many different answers you can get after collecting, for instance, a hundred replies!

In our lives, the four types of knowledge are deeply interconnected. Common sense assumptions, such as how to be forgiving or resilient, have always been part of people's knowledge about their individual lives. A continually moving flow of new facts and opinions constantly changes these views. At certain times in history, as we will see later in the book, values—often associated with religion or politics—have had a tremendous impact on other types of knowledge. Studies show that individuals who are good at math and statistics suddenly stop using reason when they discuss research results that threaten their values (Kahan, 2012). Values affect science, and the sciences influence values. All four types of knowledge remain inseparable parts of our inquiry into personality because we are learning not only what personality is but also how personality has been understood in the past, how people view it today, and how people apply their knowledge to their lives.

Let's return to The Mirror Effect, the book on narcissistic personality. What knowledge does it convey to the reader? Many of the book’s ideas are based on tabloid stories, radio and television interviews, and personal observations. However, this book is also rooted in science. The authors first published their research in the peer-reviewed Journal of Research of Personality (Pinsky & Young, 2006). The book also discusses today's values that lead so many young people to be obsessed with the lives of celebrities. Overall, the book is a valuable source of information about personality. Yet the challenge remains: We need to distinguish among scientific facts, popular ideas, value judgments, and legal facts.
Knowledge and Theory

We certainly hope the knowledge that we gain about personality has everything to do with facts. Facts, even the most comprehensive and accurate ones, have to be explained. Our knowledge also requires analysis, which is the breaking of something complex into smaller parts to understand their essential features and relations. This step is difficult enough, but even more is needed. If psychologists did only analysis, they would remain hopelessly confused by the multitude of research data, facts, numbers, and opinions. Which facts are accurate? Which facts are more important than others? To answer these and other questions, we have to look at the facts in light of broader ideas about personality. The ancient Greeks called this knowledge “from above” or theory (θεωρία). Applied to personality, theory is a type of comprehensive, scientific explanation about what personality is, how it develops, and how it functions.

- Theory is based on scientific knowledge and serves as a powerful tool in the studies of personality.
- Theory allows us to transform a formless heap of research data and opinions into a logical construction.
- Theory provides an explanation for a particular observation and through new assumptions suggests a number of hypotheses that can be tested to support or challenge the theory.
- Theory can then be applied to see if it explains many known facts and if new facts can be explained by the theory. Theorizing about personality requires both strong empirical knowledge and, of course, a measure of imagination (see Figure 1.3).

**FIGURE 1.3  ● Knowledge and Theory in Studying Personality**

Theory: comprehensive, scientific explanation about what personality is, how it develops, and the way it functions

Transforms facts into logical constructions

Explains facts and provides new hypotheses

Applies, tests knowledge

FACTS

FACTS
The scientific study of personality has a broad and varied history with an abundance of theories. We will take a closer look at many of them in the following chapters. In the process of gaining knowledge about personality, we will also examine major psychological schools that have contributed and continue to impact our knowledge of personality. We will study facts and theories suggested by psychologists working in different countries and using different methods. We also look at a wide range of ideas and theories created by those whose work did not necessarily fit into these convenient categories.

**Personality Theories and Academic Traditions**

We can approach (or come near to) what we label *personality* from different angles. **Personality psychology**—a branch of psychology that studies personality—has been studied for a relatively short period, about 100 years. However, personality psychology carries the influences of the knowledge accumulated within various approaches and scholarly disciplines.

Many theories of personality developed within **academic traditions**. These traditions bring together scholars that share similar views on a particular scientific approach, subject, or method. At least two types of such traditions exist. First, there are actual associations involving interacting individuals—the followers of an academic tradition. Second, there are traditions as convenient symbols to indicate a similarity in views among people who may or may not know one another. Some traditions remain short-lived. They emerge, capture the imagination of their followers, and then lose their appeal. Other academic traditions remain influential for many years. Psychoanalysis was a dominant field providing major theoretical views of personality approximately until the 1960s. It has generally lost its dominant position in the second half of the last century (we discuss this tradition in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5). However, even though some theories have lost their leading roles, we continue studying them today. Like pieces in a jigsaw puzzle, they are important elements of contemporary personality theory.

Academic traditions perform several functions. The first is organizational. Scientists have to exchange their ideas and discuss their research with one another. Discussion societies and clubs involving scientists were common in the past. In the 18th century, the famous French intellectual Paul-Henri Thiry (known also as Baron d’Holbach) established the *salon*: a regular get-together of progressive thinkers, authors, and educators. Liberal-minded philosophers discussed materialism and atheism and criticized the oppressive rule of the king. Psychoanalysts in the 20th century also formed groups to discuss new ideas, current research, and its applications. Researchers who study personality also belong to different academic organizations that conduct regular meetings and publish journals.

The second function is consolidation of knowledge. Quite often, several scholars working on the same problem or using the same theoretical approach can work more efficiently than can individual scholars working separately. There are long-term informal associations, their purpose being to let their participants collaborate and share research findings and theoretical assumptions. Such associations may gain recognition among scholars of two or more generations. Prominent scholars of the 20th century,
such as Sigmund Freud, William James, Kurt Lewin, Anna Freud, B. F. Skinner, Jean Piaget, and many others, cared about their students and followers—those who could and would continue research traditions of their mentors. Many psychologists actively and deliberately recruited their assistants, associates, and followers to keep their research traditions alive (Krantz & Wiggins, 1973). They do this today.

The third function of academic traditions is protection and control. Quite often in the past, government elites would support some academic traditions and reject others (Kusch, 1999). Formal academic associations frequently played the role of censors. In the context of knowledge, censorship is a deliberate practice of selecting and disseminating what is deemed “appropriate” knowledge (from someone’s point of view) and restricting knowledge deemed inappropriate. Censorship can be political, as in Russia or Iran where the law prohibits academic study related to gays, lesbians, and transgender individuals. Fortunately, censorship is rather a rare phenomenon in contemporary science.

In summary, certain academic traditions create favorable conditions for particular types of research of personality and development of scientific knowledge. A strong academic support of a theory, or its rejection, is crucial for this theory’s survival and future impact. It is always important to examine which methodology is chosen to support a theory.

CHECK AND APPLY YOUR KNOWLEDGE

1. What is the difference between values and popular beliefs?
2. What discrepancies between values and individual behavior can you name as you observe people’s everyday interactions?
3. Think about your day. Recall the situations in which you were using legal knowledge and scientific knowledge in making decisions or judging other people.
4. What is the book The Mirror Effect about?
5. Name the functions of academic traditions.
6. Ask your professor to which academic group or society does she or he belong. Ask if this is an international or national group or whether it is local. What do they do as members of this group?

Applying Knowledge About Personality

Studying personality remains a theoretical endeavor as long as we do not pay attention to the practical value of the research into personality. Personality psychology as a discipline should offer solutions to many psychological and social problems of today’s world. It also has to offer practical suggestions about how to unleash the potentials
that everyone has inside. In the following chapters, we will discuss the applications of personality psychology.

Areas of Application

*Would you like to learn about your major strengths and weaknesses?*

*Do want to learn what would be the most important personality features of your ideal soul mate?*

*Which job will be an ideal match for your personality type?*

When I ask my students on the first day of class whether these questions interest them, practically everyone says that they do. Most of us are curious about who we are as individuals and how we can use this knowledge. In the past, philosophers and natural scientists, doctors and educators, explorers and experimentalists have all attempted to bring the power of scientific knowledge to solve practical issues referring to our personalities. For starters, let’s mention a few areas of applications.

To improve treatment procedures, doctors use research into personality to distinguish different patterns of their patients’ behavior. Medical professionals recognize that different people understand their symptoms differently and that their personalities have a lot to do with how these symptoms should be explained. *Personalized medicine* is an applied field in which clinical professionals use an individual’s unique personality characteristics to choose the most effective treatments (Collins, 2010). As an example, a patient’s critical thinking skills (either developed or not), motivation level (high or low), and general emotional tone (optimistic or pessimistic) can greatly affect the way this individual understands treatment recommendations and follows them (Bray, 2010).

A professional’s knowledge about personality disorders (we will study them in Chapter 12), measuring their severity, provides valuable knowledge about diagnoses, treatment, and prevention of other psychological disorders (Tyrer & Johnson, 1996). Even seemingly insignificant behavioral features may provide clues about potentially significant psychological problems. Japanese researchers, for example, found that people with symptoms of clinical depression tend to move differently than people without depressive symptoms (Nakamura et al., 2007).

Applied to clinical and counseling psychology, research into personality allows therapists to create new procedures and methods to help people recover from physical and mental abuse and discontinue their harmful habits and behavioral patterns (Jones, 2008). Knowledge of specific personality features of victims suffering from acute stress helps psychologists apply special therapeutic techniques during natural disasters or violent conflicts (Bemak, Chung, & Pedersen, 2003). Knowledge about specific factors of individual decision-making in health-related issues helps psychologists make changes in people’s behavior with respect to their daily nutrition choices, hygiene, and reproductive health (Leenen et al., 2008). Children diagnosed with autism spectrum disorders may benefit from specific recommendations related to the
development of the ability to delay immediate impulse gratification—an important personality feature, which we will discuss in Chapter 2 (Faja & Dawson, 2013).

In education, many applications of personality psychology help improve educational effectiveness. Educational success is based, along with many other factors, on the type of motivation that teachers and students bring to classrooms. Successful learning is often about the ability to perform difficult, sometimes tedious tasks. Many factors influence this ability. However, individuals who have developed a strong sense of learning and who believe that they study for an important and socially meaningful goal perform better on many educational tasks, including the most boring ones. This knowledge allows psychologists to provide effective help in forming such traits in students (Yeager et al., 2014). Self-discipline can be improved not only by means of repetition but also through a deeper understanding of long-term, socially meaningful goals of studying.

Applied to business, research into personality provides knowledge about skills assessment, performance evaluation, and creative potentials related to various professional activities. Psychologists suggest effective methods for job-related, competitive selection processes. Psychologists studying personality also make a strong contribution to organization development—planned changes targeted at improving organizational and individual performance and well-being in an established private business, a government institution, or a start-up (Frank, Lueger, & Korunka, 2007). Psychologists also study common errors and individual weaknesses related to a wide range of professional activities. For example, if you are a defendant or witness in court, do you hope for fair judgments from the members of the court and jurors? Studies show that many factors can sway the jurors’ perceptions and judgments, including their ages, preexisting beliefs, and the appearance of the defendants. These findings are used in legal training of professionals as well as in jury-selection procedures (Quas et al., 2007).
In the forensic and security fields, studies into personality help practitioners better identify suspects, create their individual profiles, and compose various patterns of criminal behavior. Chapter 12, for example, discusses research into the personality of stalkers, or individuals engaged in persistent and unwanted pursuit of another person. National intelligence has long used help from professionals studying personality characteristics of foreign leaders (Post & George, 2004). The growing field of cyber security is in significant need of scientific data that explains the behavior of hackers. Studies into personality (including research of individual prejudice and intolerance) help psychologists train specialists in conflict analysis, prevention, and resolution (Brewer & Pierce, 2005). Cooperation between personality psychologists and political scientists provided insight in the study of global terrorism. Psychologists today know more about individual traits of those who commit acts of violence and martyrdom (Bélanger, Caouette, Sharvit, & Dugas, 2014). Studies suggest that many radicalized youth could respond positively to reeducation and deradicalization efforts and return to violence-free life (Stern, 2010). See Figure 1.4 for a review of personality theories’ applications. Which other application areas could you suggest?

**CHECK AND APPLY YOUR KNOWLEDGE**

1. What are the main areas of application of personality psychology?
2. Name at least one applied area or issue that you think should have been mentioned here.

**Steps in Applying Knowledge**

Personality psychology—as a discipline—engages in an important applied mission of promoting science, reason, and educated social action. Psychologists expect that you will enrich and modify your view of yourself and others based on your analysis and evaluation of the facts developed in personality psychology. Psychologists also expect that you could make educated improvements in your life. What specific steps can you take to make these improvements?

There are at least three steps people can take to improve themselves in three different yet interconnected contexts of our lives: the individual, the interpersonal, and the global.

**The Individual Context**

Studying personality, you will learn critical judgments about yourself and other people. Studies show that many people wrongly believe they are competent enough
to make good decisions about their lives. Unfortunately, they tend to be incompetent because they do not have enough knowledge about themselves and other people. People who are incompetent tend to make two kinds of mistakes. First (because of their lack of knowledge), they reach too many erroneous conclusions that guide them in making too many wrong choices in relationships, business, and education. Second, their incompetence does not allow them to realize that they have already made too many mistakes (Dunning & Kruger, 1999). Therefore, to avoid these mistakes, do the following:

• Apply the knowledge you gain from this book (and from the lectures) to self. Ask this question: How is this knowledge relevant to my life?
• Learn about your strengths and weaknesses. Evaluate your strengths and try to learn from your accomplishments. Examine your mistakes and try to explain why they occur.
• Examine which events or issues consistently make you (1) happy and (2) unhappy.
• After reading or summarizing a chapter or a part of it, ask two questions: How did this research help me in my development and growth? How can I use this theory to become a better person?

The Interpersonal Context

Our goals in life can be self-oriented (I want to be an interesting and attractive person) and socially oriented (I want to make a difference in this world as a person). Studies show that people who set and then pursue their socially oriented goals can develop stronger will and a better ability to overcome difficulties compared with those who set self-oriented goals (Yeager et al., 2014). Your life should mean something to others. You can be more efficient and helpful because other people certainly need your knowledge and skills. You can apply your knowledge in social contexts of your life in the following ways:

• Think of your classmates, friends, and family members. There is always someone who needs help, advice, and guidance. Relate your knowledge to others.
• When you are in need, turn to others for guidance and help. They may know something that you don’t.
• Specifically, after reading a chapter or a part of it, ask these questions: How can I use this knowledge to help others? How can I use this knowledge to ask others to help me improve and achieve?

The Global Context

Apply your knowledge to the global world and to your entire life. Psychologists today have embraced a progressive view of their discipline. This means that to improve the lives of people, concerned professionals and citizens should engage in an educated, deliberate, and planned intervention in many areas of our society. Today, we commonly call such a planned intervention “social policy.” For psychology professionals, progressivism means an opportunity to apply scientific knowledge directly to social issues. Progressivism also emphasizes the importance of applied psychological
knowledge in three areas: (1) health care, (2) education, and (3) social services. Therefore, you can apply your knowledge in global contexts in the following ways:

- Think about yourself and others from a greater perspective. What do you want to achieve globally? What is your role, your mission as an individual in this life, in this world?
- As a person, what are you bringing to the world? What do you want to be recognized for?
- Specifically, after reading a chapter or any part of it, ask this question: How can I use this knowledge to make a real difference in life? Ask others to answer this question. And then think, discuss, and do something useful.

Most of us probably will not be involved in national policy making or global decisions. Yet we all can make a difference by promoting scientific knowledge and critically discussing and applying it. During class discussions and seminars, in articles and public lectures, in the media and online social networks, or during face-to-face contacts, we can review both new and classical research findings, promote our original ideas, influence each other’s opinions, change common stereotypes, and, most importantly, help other people. The first step is to gain knowledge. Let’s get back to work.
### Personality Theories

**Visual Review**

#### INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTS

**Personality:**
A stable set of behavioral and experiential characteristics of an individual

These characteristics...
...are consistent
...are organized
...influence the individual’s behavior

Personality can be described as a coexistence of several psychological dichotomies

#### KEY THEORIES AND APPROACHES

Four types of knowledge:
- Scientific
- Popular
- Values
- Legal

Personality theory is a type of comprehensive, scientific explanation about what personality is, how it develops, and how it functions

Many theories of personality developed within particular academic traditions

#### APPLICATIONS

Areas of application:
- Personalized medicine
- Clinical and counseling psychology
- Education
- Business, forensic, and security fields ...and more

Three contexts:
- Individual
- Interpersonal
- Global
Summary

• Personality is not easy to define, and there are several views on what personality is. We understand personality as a stable set of behavioral and experiential characteristics of an individual.

• Personality refers to both unique and typical, distinguishable patterns of behavior and experience; together, they will be called personality traits. Taken together, in a combination, an individual’s traits form a certain type. Type refers to a kind or category of elements or features sharing similar characteristics or features.

• Some features can be called central because they tend to be broad and general. Peripheral personality features are associated with central ones, yet they tend to be more specific, more relevant to particular individuals and specific circumstances. Central features are not necessarily more important or valuable than peripheral.

• Personality can be stable and evolving at the same time. Stability and change are based on many interconnected influences. Research has established that during the life-span we as individuals keep many of our personality characteristics relatively stable. Most personality-related changes take place during childhood. Our personalities become more or less stable in the middle age, and are least changeable after people reach approximately age 50. Exceptions to these expectations are plenty.

• Personality can be viewed as normal and abnormal. Tolerance threshold is a measure of tolerance or intolerance toward specific personality traits in a society or a cultural group. Tolerance thresholds are tested in specific social situations. Personality disorders are enduring patterns of behavior and inner experience that deviate markedly from the expectations of the individual’s culture.

• Our behavioral patterns and experiences that become a core of our personality are likely to be explained by a combination of biological and social factors. The debates about complex interactions of natural (biological) factors and social (cultural) influences have always been the focus of attention in social sciences and psychology.

• Understanding the mechanisms of the mind–body interactions has been one of the most challenging topics of research and intellectual debates in the history of science and one of the most intriguing problems in psychology.

• Personality is active and reactive. Determinism encourages psychologists to study how personality was formed (in the past) and how personality features affect behavior and experience now and in the future. Psychologists generally avoid fatalism, which states that we, as humans, are not in control of our actions and thoughts because something or somebody else (like God, fate, or chance) predetermines them.

• At least four types of knowledge related to personality are relevant to our discussion: scientific knowledge, popular beliefs, values, and legal knowledge. These types constantly interact.

• Knowledge requires analysis, which is the breaking of something complex into smaller parts to understand their essential features and relations. Applied to personality, theory is a type of comprehensive, scientific explanation about what personality is and how it develops and functions.

• Many theories of personality developed within particular academic traditions. These traditions bring together scholars that share similar views on a particular scientific approach, subject, or method.
Personality theories find applications in many walks of life. Philosophers and natural scientists, doctors and educators, curious explorers and experimentalists, and then professional psychologists try to apply their knowledge of personality to a wide variety of human activities.

### Key Terms

- academic traditions 25
- analysis 24
- censorship 26
- central 9
- cynicism 10
- determinism 16
- fatalism 16
- knowledge 18
- legal knowledge 22
- nature–nurture debate 14
- peripheral 9
- personality 4
- personality disorders 13
- personality psychology 25
- pessimism 9
- pop psychology 21
- popular (or folk) beliefs 20
- scarcity mindset 16
- scientific knowledge 19
- self-determination 16
- self-enhance 10
- theory 24
- tolerance threshold 13
- traits 4
- type 9
- values 21

### Evaluating What You Know

Define *personality*.

Explain the three principles referring to personality.

Explain personality’s dichotomies and give examples.

Describe the four types of knowledge related to personality; provide examples.

Explain how the four types of knowledge interact.

Describe the areas of application of knowledge about personality.

Describe the steps in applying knowledge.

### A Bridge to the Next Chapter

Studying personality should be interesting yet challenging. We are not the first to start this journey. Early philosophers, doctors, and scientists have laid the foundations for personality theory. Year after year, decade after decade, psychologists, like prospectors, tried to gather different theories, concepts,
methods, and approaches to find valuable “nuggets” of knowledge about personality. Offering their findings for critical peer review or other forms of evaluation, psychologists began to “filter” and accumulate the best, most successful, and effective methods of investigation and psychological intervention. Travel and publications made this knowledge available to more psychologists globally. More scientists began to combine methods received from different schools to critically examine personality and then apply this knowledge. Psychologists gain their knowledge from other disciplines, including biology, medicine, social sciences, computer sciences, sociology, behavioral economics, and philosophy. This list can easily be continued.

We are at the beginning of our journey. Our next step, in the following chapter, will be to examine how science, social sciences, and the humanities throughout their long histories have contributed to our knowledge of personality today.
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