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Abstract

Cross-cultural assessment in South Africa has become more prominent since the first democratic elections held in April 1994, as stronger demands for the cultural appropriateness of psychological tests have been made. The use of psychometric testing, including personality assessment in the workplace, is now strictly controlled by legislation, among others the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996), the Labour Relations Act (66 of 1995), and the Employment Equity Act (55 of 1998), and the Health Professions Act (56 of 1974).

The present study forms part of the development process of the South African Personality Inventory (SAPI), which seeks to explore the indigenous personality structure of all the 11 official language groups found in South Africa and to then develop a personality inventory based on this. The present study aimed to explore and describe the personality facets and clusters that were found among a sample of 95 Xhosa-speaking South Africans. An exploratory descriptive research method was used and participants were selected by means of non-probability purposive sampling. Data were gathered by administering a biographical questionnaire and a tape-recorded 10-item interview questionnaire.

Content analysis was used to analyse and reduce the data obtained from interviews into personality descriptors. Of the 1872 personality-descriptive words obtained from the interview questions, 164 facets of different personality characteristics were finally configured as a consequence of a data-reduction process. These facets were further categorised into a total of 37 personality sub-clusters and nine personality clusters which were labelled as Extraversion, Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Intellect, Openness, Integrity, Relationship Harmony and Facilitating. These clusters and their sub-clusters resonate well with significant aspects and values of the Xhosa culture (e.g., Ubuntu). There also seems to be a moderate correspondence between the clusters and sub-clusters identified in the Xhosa-speaking sample and factors of the Five-Factor Model, especially with respect to the six clusters of Extraversion, Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Intellect, and Openness. Nonetheless, differences in the composition of the clusters/facets were found, some of which are due to the more unique facets and sub-facets of personality identified in the Xhosa-speaking sample.
The limitations of the study are identified and suggestions are made for further research.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Chapter Preview

In this chapter a general orientation to the research study is presented. The purpose of the present study, and its proposed aims and objectives will be described. Finally, a delineation is presented of the chapters that follow.

1.2 General Orientation to the Research Study

Despite the fact that few studies have been conducted to investigate the comparability of results across different cultural groups, personality tests continue to be used in South Africa. The post-apartheid government inherited a system of separate tests designed for racially defined groups, with the result that few tests have been standardized for all South Africans (Moletsane, 2004).

Given the lack of adequate measures, the practice of using tests which were initially developed for the white, westernized population with other cultural groups and applying the norms ‘with caution’ has arisen (Foxcroft, 1997). Test developers thus face the challenge of constructing common, unbiased psychometric tests with norms that are not necessarily constructed along racial lines (Foxcroft, 1997). Since the first democratic elections in 1994, South Africa has had a new constitution. The situation relating to the classification, possession, control and use of psychological tests used for assessing individuals within a working context has become strictly controlled by legislation (Mauer, 2000).

At present there is no personality inventory available for the Xhosa-speaking people in South Africa (HSRC Test Catalogue, 2000) even though there is a growing interest in the measurement of personality variables in applied settings. Through the 1940s and 50s work in the psychometric domain was focused rather practically on the educability and trainability of Black South Africans. According to McAinsh (1993) the personality tests generally used in this country have been imported from abroad. Examples of these include the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the California Personality Inventory (CPI), and
the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). These, as well as South African-based personality tests (e.g., the South African Personality Questionnaire [SAPQ]), are not necessarily suitable for administration on the Xhosa population, as the standardization procedures have often been developed from the English and Afrikaans-speaking population of South Africa. In the light of this, the interpretations made from the SAPQ of a Xhosa individual’s profile may not be an accurate reflection of his/her personality or of the norms within this culture.

The shortage of appropriate tests presents problems for both clinicians and researchers. Clinicians are typically faced with the option of either using a test which is not fully appropriate, making very cautious interpretations, or alternatively they have to rely on clinical observations alone. Researchers seldom have a reliable instrument from which to work. The result of this is that in order for them to conduct research involving the use of a personality test, they usually have to either construct or adapt a test.

According to Shillington (1988), there are various obstacles in the construction of new personality tests, including that:

- It is a time-consuming process given that the evolution of a test from construction to perfection can extend over many years;
- It is also an expensive process as many people have to be employed and several pilot studies may need to be undertaken in order to reach the final test version; and
- It is almost impossible to make cross-national comparisons with indigenously developed tests. The only way in which these cross-national comparisons would be possible would be for the new test to be both translated and adapted, or for it to have been shown to measure the same construct as an existing test. Establishing construct validity is both a lengthy and exhausting process, and as such, has not been carried out for a large proportion of the available tests.

Based on the above-mentioned difficulties, it would appear that it would be more beneficial to select an internationally well researched personality test and adapt it for use in a local setting or particular population group. According to Hambleton (1994), the term ‘adapt’
encompasses translation, as it is a broader term, reflecting ‘the process of preparing a test or instrument for use in a second language or culture’ (p.230). The process of selecting an existing test for this type of study is complex. The researcher not only needs to be aware of the types of available tests, but must also be knowledgeable of the current research involving these tests, as well as having a critical appraisal of theses tests (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1997).

As commented on by Shillington (1988) and Van Ede (1996), other factors also need to be examined when making a choice to adapt or develop a test. Among these are:

- The test should be valid and reliable.
- It would be favourable if the test were scored objectively, as this would enable the results to be replicated.
- Transportation of the test should be reasonably easy and it would be advantageous if administration thereof did not require many additional material besides a pencil and eraser.
- The scoring process should also be easy.
- In order to increase the cost-efficiency of the test, it would be preferable for it to have a variety of applications.
- Likewise it would be helpful if the test was applicable to a wide range of people.
- The test should be appropriate for the purpose for which it is intended. In this regard, it would be necessary to establish whether it is suitable for the age groups, educational levels and genders of the participants.
- The constructs should also be transportable from the one culture to the other.
- The language difficulty level should be evaluated and the items need to be easily comprehensible.
- If the test had already been adapted and translated for various other populations, especially a population in South Africa, this would serve as an endorsement for its use.
- In order to facilitate cross-national research, it would be advantageous if the test is well known and widely used.
South Africa is a veritable melting-pot of culture and tradition, different cultures often deriving their influence from entirely different continents (Taylor, 2000). The use of a number of tests, which have not been properly validated to be used in selection decisions within a multicultural context, is still rampant. Cross-cultural assessment has emerged as a very popular research area and plays an important role in cross-cultural studies, as test scores provide the basis for cross-cultural comparisons (Meiring, 2007). Challenges in establishing and ensuring equity in cross-cultural assessment have not been solved adequately in modern South Africa, despite the recent legislation and increased attention for this topic.

1.3 Purpose of the study

This study will form part of an extensive national project that aims to develop a comprehensive questionnaire to assess personality among all South African language (cultural) groups. This unified personality inventory will take both universal and unique personality factors found in the various culture groups in South Africa into consideration. It is anticipated that this research will contribute to the development of an indigenous personality psychology, and it is expected that this personality inventory may become a useful research tool in the South African context.

1.4 Primary Aims of the Research

The study has two main aims:

1. The first aim is to explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speaking South Africans
2. The second aim is to explore and describe any possible relationship between personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speakers and current models of personality.

1.5 Delineation of the Research

This study consists of 7 chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the study and provides an overview of the contextual background of the research. Chapter 2 is a literature review on personality assessment and personality theories. Chapter 3 addresses cross-cultural issues with particular reference to cross-cultural testing and test development. Chapter 4 presents the research
problem, followed by the aims of the study. Chapter 5 outlines the methodology and research design used in this study. The research design, sampling procedures, measures, research procedure, data analysis and ethical considerations are explored. Chapter 6 presents the results as well as a discussion of the results of the study. Lastly, Chapter 7 provides conclusions based on the results of the research. The limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research in this area are presented.
2.1 Chapter Preview

This chapter begins by defining the field of psychology, the concept of personality, and personality psychology. The assessment of personality is then addressed followed by a brief outline of personality theories with emphasis on trait theories. A description of the five-factor model of personality which developed from the trait theories as well as a discussion of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory will follow.

2.2 Introduction

The field of psychology is broad, comprising a large number of specialised areas. Areas of specialisation include: (a) developmental psychology, (b) social psychology, (c) neuropsychology, (d) industrial and organisational psychology, (e) educational psychology, forensic psychology and (f) personality psychology. Personality psychology provides psychologists with a framework within which they are able to conceptualize their clients. Emanating from the field of personality psychology are many theories. These theories are the culmination of the hypotheses that psychologists make about human functioning and facilitate communicating this knowledge to others. Personality psychologists often employ tools to facilitate the assessment of personality, a field of psychometric expertise unique to psychologists.

2.3 The Concept of Personality and Personality Psychology

The word personality is derived from the word “persona”, which has Greek and Latin roots and refers to the theatrical masks worn by Greek actors (Pervin & John, 2001). In 1937 Allport surveyed the literature, to date, and concluded that there were at least fifty definitions of the concept, and that there was therefore no single, accepted definition of personality. This is still so. Personality is a complex construct, for which there is no simple definition. Carl Jung, a psychiatrist, stated that our present personality is determined by both who and what we have been, and also by the person we hope to become (Jung, 1990). This theorist
believed that an individual’s personality is comprised of opposing forces that gain energy from the psyche, with one pole dominating the other, resulting in a more dominant personality type (Jung, 1990). Schultz (1990) and Meyer, Moore and Viljoen (1997) define personality as the changing, but nevertheless relatively stable, organisation of all the physical, psychological and spiritual characteristics of the individual which determine his or her behaviour and interaction with the context in which the individual finds him or herself. Aiken (1997) defines human personality as the sum total of all the qualities, traits and behaviours that characterise a person, and by which, together with his or her physical attributes, the person is perceived as an individual.

According to Moller (1995), personality is usually described in one of two ways. It is either on the basis of a particular characteristic of a person, or on the basis of certain social skills that a person possesses and the effectiveness with which they elicit favourable responses from others. Although definitions of personality are so diverse, some commonalities can be found when these definitions are perused (Moller, 1995). Firstly, personality refers to the characteristic structure, combination, and organisation of the behavioural patterns, thoughts, and emotions that make every human being unique. Secondly, personality helps the individual to adjust to his or her unique, daily circumstances of life. Thirdly, personality refers to the dynamic nature of the individual as well as to his or her tendency to react fairly consistently or predictably in a variety of situations over time.

According to Maddi (1996), an acceptable compromise is to define personality as:

A stable set of tendencies and characteristics that determine those commonalities and differences in people’s psychological behaviour, thoughts, feelings and actions that have continuity in time and that may not be easily understood as the sole result of the social and biological pressures of the moment (p.8).

The study of personality, known as personality psychology, has been a field of interest since the 1900s. When considering a definition of personality, it is important to remember that individuals are unique and they do not behave in exactly the same way in all situations. There is, however, substantial commonality in human behaviour (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1997). Saunder (2002) defines personality psychology as “the study of individuals’ distinct characteristics or personality traits that determine their differences in behaviour”. In addition,
Bergh (2003) explains that personality psychology is the study of consistent and repetitive patterns of behaviour which affect people’s functioning in their environment. Bergh (2003) argues that there is, to a certain degree, some agreement on the aspects that should be included. These include the following:

a) The external visible or observable physical appearances, behaviour and traits, the original meaning of personality;

b) Possible invisible, covert, or unconscious behaviours, emotions, attitudes, values, thoughts and feelings within people;

c) Enduring patterns and consistencies, but also the dynamic natures of behaviour, indicating motivation and change;

d) The uniqueness of each person;

e) Organisation and wholeness or differentiation in personality, a person being body and mind with all its separate and integrated functions; and

f) The necessity to accept that personality refers to a living human able to adapt to situations (p. 37).

Personality psychology has been described as the most ambitious and encompassing subfield of psychology (Phares & Trull, 1997). It seeks to describe and explain individual differences, and to synthesise the many processes that influence an individual’s interaction with the environment into an integrated account of the total person (Phares & Trull, 1997). Within personality psychology, personality theories provide systems for describing, explaining and comparing people and their behaviours (Liebert & Spiegler, 1998).

According to Magnusson (1989), personality psychology aims to develop theories and conducting empirical research on the functioning of a person as a holistic being. Theories provide frames of reference for interpreting assessment outcomes. In addition to this, they also serve to organise and clarify observations, provide a sense of understanding of the subject matter, and guide future research (Liebert & Spiegler, 1998). The interaction between theories on personality and the measurement of personality is mutually beneficial, as progress in respect of the one is dependent and influential on advancement in the other (Huysamen, 1997). While the area of personality psychology consists of different approaches (e.g., psychoanalytic, dispositional, phenomenological and behavioural), each of them address issues such as structure of personality, development of personality, optimal personality
development, dynamics of personality, research procedures, and assessment of personality (Liebert & Spiegler, 1998).

For this study emphasis will be focused more on definitions by trait theorists. Trait theories are among the oldest theories of describing personality. They involve dividing people into distinct categories and classifying them according to one type or another (Papalia & Olds, 1990). Gregory (1996, p.505) defines a trait as “any relatively enduring way in which individuals differ from another. There will be more discussion on trait theory in the next section.

2.4 Personality Assessment

During the 1980s and 1990s, the status of psychological testing grew, because of the increased usage of testing in several major branches of applied psychology. Psychological assessment continues to be a high-profile activity for practising clinicians. According to Anastasi (1997) personality assessment is the area of psychometric assessment concerned with the affective or non-intellectual aspects of behaviour. In conventional psychometric terminology, “personality tests are instruments for the measurement of emotional, motivational, interpersonal and attitudinal characteristics, as distinguished from abilities, interests and attitudes” (Anastasi, 1997, p.523).

Personality theories provide a frame of reference for interpreting the outcome of assessment in particular. The interaction between personality theories and personality assessment measures is mutually beneficial, as progress in respect of the one is dependent and influential on advancement in the other (Huysamen, 1997). Murphy and Davidshofer (1991) implied that if both an individual’s personality dimensions and behaviour are not to narrow or specific, then personality assessments may provide a meaningful method of predicting individual differences in general patterns of behaviour.

To be useful, personality measures must meet certain specifications. Measures for assessing personality must demonstrate that they yield reproducible and consistent results and that they measure what they are intended to measure. Standardised personality instruments are therefore a preferred source of measurement as they are established quantities, i.e., they have published norms and have shown their reliability, validity and predictive utility (Costa &
McCrae, 1997). Furthermore, personality assessments designed to measure a construct that is part of a theory should achieve construct validity (Phares & Trull, 1997).

2.4.1 Categories of Personality Assessment

Personality assessments are often broadly categorized into:

a) Projective techniques, which consist of unstructured, ambiguous items, are designed to elicit a wide range of responses. It is assumed that, upon presentation of the stimuli, individuals project their covert needs, desires, and attitudes into the tasks, revealing their personality (Huysamen, 1997; Murphy & Davidshofer, 1997). According to Phares and Trull (1997), projective techniques involve “discovering a person’s characteristic modes of behaviour by observing his behaviour in response to a situation that does not elicit or compel a particular response” (p.220);

b) Ratings by a third party concerning the behaviour of the individual being assessed (Huysamen, 1997). Researchers often use rating scales in an attempt to obtain a more accurate account of an individual’s behaviour. An observer rates the extent to which an individual displays a certain attribute. One of the shortcomings of rating scales is that raters may have a general tendency to respond very strictly or too leniently, resulting in a skewed distribution (Huysamen, 1997);

c) Objective questionnaires or self-report inventories which involve the administration of a standard set of questions or statements to which the examinee responds using a fixed set of options (Huysamen, 1997).

2.5 Personality Theories

A theory is a set of interrelated statements proposed to explain certain observations of reality (McAdams, 1994). All theories are tentative and somewhat speculative abstractions, only accepted if they are consistent with observations of the phenomena the theory purports to explain, and subject to change if new and inconsistent observation arises. According to McAdams (1994) theories provide tools that can be used to increase understanding, as they provide (a) a particular picture of reality, (b) well-defined terms that name the major components of that picture, (c) specified relationships among the components, and (d) specific predictions about how these relationships can be tested in empirical research.
Theories provide frames of reference for interpreting assessment outcomes. In addition, they also serve to organise and clarify observations, provide a sense of understanding of the subject matter, and guide future research (Liebert & Spiegler, 1998).

Personality theories could serve as conceptual frameworks for describing, predicting and explaining human behaviour (Barrick & Ryan, 2003; Coetzee, 2003). Personality theories serve as guides to the measurement and understanding of personality, as well as providing a frame of reference for the interpretation of assessment findings. Personality theory endeavours to explain individual differences according to a model of human functioning. Each personality theory is an attempt to develop a system for describing, explaining, and comparing people and their behaviour (Bergh & Theron, 2003).

Meyer (1997) defines personality theory as the result of a purposeful and sustained effort to develop a logically consistent conceptual system for the description, explanation, comparison and/or prediction of human behaviour. Despite the lack of consensus regarding personality theories, they are valuable in that they provide a number of common denominators from which to view human nature. These theories generally provide an underlying view of humankind, with certain assumptions about the nature and the existence of people. These ideas about the core functioning of human beings provide understanding of what is common to all people, and a basis for exploring specific aspects of human functioning, including individual differences in people. Furthermore, personality theories also elaborate on the structural concepts or the “working parts” which make up the personality, and explain how a person functions as a whole. The dynamics of personality are also explained, for instance, what enables the person to function, or what motivates behaviour.

These theories also elaborate on the development of the personality (i.e., how the structural and dynamic aspects of personality change from infancy) and provide views on psychopathology. Although personality theories tend to differ with regard to the diagnosis, study and measurement of psychopathology, particular emphasis is placed on adjustment and deviance, aspects which are considered in the selection of treatment options (Phares, 1992). Furthermore, in some cases, these theories provide a description of the ideal personality or optimal development. It is important to note that both personality theories and research findings pertaining to the origins, structure and dynamics of personality are continually developing and changing (Aiken, 1997). Personality theories then, although diverse, present
an integrated view of personality, research procedures, personality change, and assessment.

Despite their shortcomings, theories can serve as guides to the measurement and understanding of personality (Aiken, 1997). They provide a frame of reference for the understanding of the development and dynamics of personality and behaviour, and particularly for interpreting assessment findings. Methods of assessing personality are essential to the study of personality itself, regardless of the theoretical approach preferred, as all areas of psychology depend on knowledge gained in research studies that rely on measurement (Brunner-Struik, 2001).

Liebert and Spiegler (1998) divide personality theory into four broad categories, namely psychoanalytic, phenomenological, behavioural, and trait theory. Each of these theoretical approaches has a preferred method of personality assessment. A brief overview of these four categories of personality theories follows. However it must be noted that for the purpose of this study particular attention will be given to the trait theory category. The objective of the current study is to uncover the personality structure of Xhosa-speaking people. The researcher intends to emulate how Allport (1936) began his research on the traits theory. He started by listing 17,953 words in the English language referring to personality characteristics and then reducing them to a shorter list of about 4,500 adjectives. Through structured interviews the researcher will gather information about personality-descriptive terms which will be reduced to personality dimensions through the use of cluster analysis.

2.5.1 Psychoanalytic Theory

Psychoanalytic theories emphasise the unconscious and the importance of past experience in accounting for current behaviour. Psychoanalytic theory claims that human personality is basically determined by psychic energy and early experiences (Spicer, 2002). The work and writing of Sigmund Freud, who has been described as the first modern personality psychologist (Liebert & Spiegler, 1998), form the basis for psychoanalytic theory. According to Freud, behaviour is determined by irrational forces, unconscious motivations, and biological and instinctual drives, which evolve through key psychosexual stages in the first six years of life (Corey, 1996).
According to this theory, normal personality development is based on the successful resolution and integration of the psychosexual stages of development, while maladjusted personality development is regarded as the result of the inadequate resolution of one of the psychosexual stages. In recent years, there have been significant developments in psychoanalytic theory, with other theorists adding important concepts that have expanded the meaning and the application of psychoanalytic theory (Phares, 1992). Liebert and Spiegler (1998) have classified these theorists into three broad camps; (a) Freudians, who closely subscribe to the work of Freud, (b) ego psychologists, who focus more on adaptation and the potential for personality development beyond childhood, and (c) the object-relation theorists, who emphasise interpersonal behaviour and relationships.

2.5.2 Phenomenological Theory

Phenomenological theorists focus on an individual’s subjective perceptions and experiences. In this theory the object of study is the world of the person (as perceived and experienced by the individual). What is real to an individual is in that person's internal frame of reference or subjective world. Thus according to this theory subjective reality takes precedence over objective reality, and it is the subjective reality that influences behaviour. The emphasis in phenomenological theory is on conscious experiences, with the focus being on the “here and now”. Although the past is considered to influence behaviour, it only becomes important in terms of “here and now” perceptions. Little emphasis is placed on childhood experiences, the search for instinctual unconscious processes, and the importance of reinforcement (Phares, 1992).

As a group, phenomenological theories are considered to be holistic, as they view behaviour in terms of an individual's entire personality. Proponents of phenomenological personality theory include the Self theory of Rogers, and the Personal Construct theory of Kelly (Phares, 1992).

2.5.3 Behavioral Theory

Behavioural theory maintains that behaviour is the product of learning. Personality is viewed as the sum total of an individual's set of learnt behaviours. Thus the focus for personality study becomes the individual's present learnt behaviour and responses in various situations.
According to Liebert and Spiegler (1998), behavioural theory grew out of behaviourism, a psychological approach adopted by John Watson (1878-1958), who postulated that psychology should be a natural science similar to biology and physics (Spicer, 2002).

The main focus of the behavioural approach is the emphasis on learning and experience, and the situational specificity of the behaviour. Situation-specificity implies that personality traits are highlighted by the particular situation in which one finds oneself. This theory also describes personality as person-centred implying that one’s personality is influenced mainly by learning as the result of present as opposed to past experiences (Liebert & Spiegler, 1997). Liebert and Spiegler have divided behaviourism into three major approaches to personality:

(a) The radical behavioural approach, which studies only overt behaviour and external stimuli, and emphasises operant and classical conditioning;
(b) The social learning approaches, which share the premise that learning has taken place in a social context, and accounts for all human behaviour, which acknowledges the importance of overt and covert behaviour, and utilises operant, classical and observational learning; and
(c) Cognitive-behavioural approaches with the primary focus being on thought or cognitive processes and covert events (p.307).

Behavioural theory is marked by a diversity of views, and includes a broad range of techniques and commitments to theory. However, the uniting central characteristics of the theory include an orientation towards treatment, a focus on behaviour, and an emphasis on learning, and rigorous assessment and evaluation (Corey, 1996).

**2.5.4 Trait Theory**

For the purpose of this research more attention will be paid to this theory. Trait theorists conceptualise traits as underlying properties, qualities, or processes that exist in individuals. In describing and studying personality, trait theorists support the premise that all human language contains terms that characterise personality traits, which are relatively enduring styles of thinking, feeling and acting. Trait theorists of personality assume that persons vary on a number of personality dimensions or scales and seek to: (a) arrive at a manageably small set of trait descriptors that can encompass the diversity of human personality; (b) craft ways
of measuring personality traits reliably and validly; and (c) discover relationships among traits and between traits and specific behaviours (Brunner-Struik, 2001). The premise motivating research in this area was that personality traits were important pieces of social information, and that each culture must have developed ways to codify and communicate trait information (McCrae & Costa, 1997).

Gordon Allport can be seen as the first trait-theorist and he defined personality as: ‘the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his or her characteristic behaviour and thought’ (Allport, 1937, p. 28). A psychophysical system is a readiness to act in a certain way, and it comprises a physiological and psychic component. Personality traits are regarded as the best psychophysical system to describe the personality of an individual (Allport, 1937). Allport argues that all traits are individual and no trait can be observed in more than a single individual. Allport maintains that traits are all unique, and if individuals could not be compared with each other, then the whole science of personality would be impossible.

To rectify the dilemma, Allport allows for all their ultimate differences, normal persons within a given cultural area tend to develop a limited number of roughly comparable modes of adjustment. The original endowment of most human beings, their stages of growth and the demands of their particular society are sufficiently standardized and comparable to lead to some basic modes of adjustment that are approximately the same from individual to individual. In short, people in different cultures or social sub-groups within society may exhibit behaviours that could be justifiably labeled and measured under the heading of common traits (Allport, 1937).

Trait theorists such as Cattell (1946) and Norman (1963) proposed that the thousands of adjectives found in the English language could be viewed as an extensive list of personality descriptions. They proposed that by factor analysing ratings on all these adjectives, a person should discover the structure of personality traits themselves. Much research within this area resulted in the development of the five-factor model (FFM) of personality (John, 1990). The FFM will be discussed extensively below.
2.6 Lexical approach to personality

Lexical studies of indigenous personality factors assume that most meaningful personality attributes tend to become encoded in language as single-word descriptors (Saucier & Goldberg, 2001). Lexical studies provide a basis for identifying a variety of personality characteristics that are of vital importance to be encoded in language. The primary significance of the lexical hypothesis is that it provides a strategy for research aimed at identifying the major dimensions of personality variation (Ashton & Lee, 2005). Common personality descriptive adjectives of various languages and investigations of personality structure based on this lexical approach have been conducted in at least a dozen languages (Ashton, Lee, Marcus, & De Vries, 2007).

Results of lexical studies in numerous languages other than English began to appear in the late 1980s. Some of these investigations produced a five-factor solution closely indicative of the Big Five Model (FFM) (Ashton et al., 2007). The FFM is composed of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability, and Intellect or Openness to Experience (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Several questionnaires measuring the FFM have been established (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Goldberg, 1990; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) and widely applied in Western and other culture backgrounds.

However, FFM can only be applied where it comes from, that is, where English is the native language of individuals (Cheung, 2004). The results from several other studies indicated that the Big Five structure is less universal than supposed in the beginning of the 1990s (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1993). Systematic comparisons among the five-factor solutions of several lexical studies have also proven the instability of the Big Five across languages. Many researchers have confirmed the same FFM in different cultures (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Bermudez, Maslach, & Ruch, 2000; McCrae, & Costa, 1997; Trull & Deary, 1997), while others found quite different personality structures in different cultures (Bond, Nakazato, & Shiraishi, 1975; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Hahn, & Comrey, 2001; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1996).

The FFM has become the dominant model in dispositional or trait psychology (Goldberg, 1990). The emergence of a five-factor model of personality has sparked an extensive amount of research in the area of personality theory and assessment over the past two decades. These
five factors domains are generally called Extraversion, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Digman, 1990). This model is not based on any single particular theory of personality, and numerous factor analyses of existing personality instruments have returned very similar structures to that of the Big Five (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1989; McCrae, Trull, Useda, Costa & McCrae, 1995). The value of such a model is that it allows the domain of personality to be represented broadly and systematically, and provides a useful solution to the question of personality structure (Digman, 1990). Three advantages of using the five-factor model of personality as a framework are:

1. It integrates a wide array of personality constructs, allowing researchers across different fields of study to communicate easily;
2. It is comprehensive, providing a means to study relations between personality and other phenomena, and;
3. It is efficient, as it offers at least a global description of personality (McCrae & John, 1992). There is also a large body of evidence that suggests that the model can be applied successfully in different cultures (e.g., Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990, Trull & Deary, 1997; Tsaousis, 1999).

According to John and Srivastava (1999), the five factor structure is derived from Cattell’s 35 variables. Cattell was one of the first researchers who developed the classification of personality traits into 16 primary factors and eight second order factors (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1992). The results reviewed suggest that the Big Five structure provides a replicable representation of the major dimensions of trait description in English (John & Srivastava, 1999). It is further argued that the five factor structure seems to generalise reliably across different types of samples, raters and methodological variations. Since generalisability across languages and cultures is another important criterion for evaluating personality taxonomies (John & Srivastava, 1999), this is significant. Taxonomic research in other languages and cultures will therefore determine the usefulness of taxonomy across cultural contexts, and test for universals and variations in the encoding of individual differences across languages and cultures (Goldberg, 1981).

Researchers have frequently shown that a five-factor model adequately accounts for the range of dispositional terms adults use to rate the personalities of other adults (Goldberg, 1990,
McCrae and Costa, 1987). A study was conducted in order to assess the cross-cultural generalisability of the FFM, utilizing highly diverse cultures with languages from 5 different language families. The results of this study strongly supported the universality of personality trait structure (McCrae & Costa, 1997). This same study led the researchers to conclude that the five-factor structure of personality in some way transcends language and may be a universal phenomenon.

There are a variety of instruments that can be scored using the FFM. These include the Sixteen Personality Factor Inventory (16PF), the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and to some extent the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Brunner-Struik, 2001). Cattell (1943) referred to the 16 factors (of the 16PF) as primary factors, as opposed to the so-called “Big Five” factors which he considered global factors. All of the primary factors correlate with global factors and could therefore be considered subfactors within them. Unlike the Five-Factor Model (FFM) measures of personality, the MBTI does not assess the ‘Neuroticism’ dimension. Yet this dimension also has an impact on occupational behaviour. (Furnham, 1994).

The only commercially available measures designed specifically to capture these five factors are the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI) and the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) (Costa & McCrae, 1992a). The NEO PI-R will be discussed below in more detail.

2.7 The NEO PI-R

Through the years, various measurements of personality have been developed based on the FFM model. These include the NEO Personality Questionnaire (NEO PI) by McCrae and Costa (1989), the Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ) by Saville and Holdsworth, and many more (Bergh & Theron, 2003; De Raad, 2000; Hendriks, Hofstee, & De Raad, 1999).

The NEO PI gave rise to the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) which is a 240-item questionnaire that is a measure of normal personality. The NEO PI-R is considered a concise measure of the five domains of personality and some of the more important traits or facets that define each domain. The NEO PI-R not only provides a concise measure of the
five main domains of personality but also examines six important facets or traits (subscales) within each domain. According to Aiken (1997), Costa and McCrae (1992a), and McCrae and Costa (1997), these are set out as follows:

- Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability (N)

The facet scales within this domain are anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability. This domain considers the general tendency to experience negative affects such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt and disgust. However, it considers more than just susceptibility to psychological distress. Individuals who score high on N are prone to have irrational ideas, to be less able to control their impulses, and to have poor coping mechanisms.

- Extraversion or Surgency (E)

Within this domain, the facet scales consist of warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions. While extraverts are sociable by nature, sociability is only one of the traits found in the domain of Extraversion. In addition to this, extraverts are typically assertive, active, and talkative. They also tend to enjoy excitement and stimulation, and generally display a cheerful manner. In this description, introversion should be seen as the absence of extraversion, rather than its opposite.

- Openness to experience or intellect, imagination, or culture (O)

Fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, and values are the facet scales that make up this domain. Much less is known about this domain in comparison to the first two domains. Open individuals tend to be more curious about their inner and outer worlds, and their lives are filed with more experience. They are willing to entertain unusual ideas and values, and are more accepting of experiencing the full range of emotions.

- Agreeableness versus antagonism (A)

In this domain, the facet scales are trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness. This is predominantly a dimension of interpersonal tendencies. The
agreeable person is basically altruistic, sympathetic towards others and helpful. He or she believes that others will return this kind of behaviour. The antagonistic person is egocentric, skeptical of others’ intentions, and competitive.

- Conscientiousness or will to achieve (C)

Within this domain, the facet scales are competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline, and deliberation. Conscientiousness is an aspect of what used to be referred to as character. People scoring high on C tend to be purposeful, strong-willed, determined, scrupulous, punctual, and reliable. Low scorers are less precise about applying their moral principles and are more lackadaisical in working toward their goals.

The NEO PI-R has been extensively researched, and its utility has been demonstrated in both clinical and research settings. The NEO PI-R is a trait measure, and is the only commercially available measure designed to capture the five domains of personality that make up the FFM. The NEO PI-R’s psychometric properties, ease of administration, scoring, interpretation, and proven validity and reliability in a number of samples, make this measure applicable to the South African context. Also, the NEO PI-R, although a measure of “normal” personality traits, has been used successfully for applications such as clinical psychology, counselling psychology and vocational counselling, and in research contexts (Costa & McCrae, 1992a). The consistency with which these five factors or dimensions of personality have been recovered led many researchers to conclude that the five-factor model is an adequate representation of the basic dimensions of personality.

A study by Heuchert, Parker, Strumf, and Myburg (2000), using the NEO PI-R with college students, showed that the fit of the model was only tenuous for both Black and White students. In an unpublished thesis, Horn (2000) examined a Xhosa translation of the NEO PI-R. The author reported that translation was difficult, in part because the Xhosa language has a restricted vocabulary with regard to personality descriptives. Some scales of the NEO PI-R showed low internal consistency estimates. Taylor (2000) conducted a cross comparability study of the NEO PI –R for Black and White employees in a work setting in South Africa. The NEO PI-R did not work as well for Blacks as it did for Whites, in particular, the Openness factor was not found in the Black sample. According to De Bruin (2005), attempts to isolate the Big Five factors among South Africans have yielded mixed (but mostly
disappointing) results when common instruments are employed. These results may be attributed in part to the cultural inappropriateness of some of the items of imported questionnaires and the complexity of the item wordings. Many people in South Africa do not have English as their first language, which means that some of the items of imported questionnaires may be poorly understood. In response to these results, Taylor and de Bruin (2005) developed the Basic Traits Inventory which is discussed below.

2.8 The Basic Traits Inventory

The Basic Traits Inventory (BTI) is an English-language measure of the Five-Factor Model that was developed to be used in the multicultural South African context (Taylor & de Bruin, 2005). The BTI has a hierarchical structure similar to that of the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992), with five broad traits on the highest level and 24 facets that serve as indicators of the factors on a lower level. Taylor and de Bruin (2005) attempted to maximize the cross-cultural suitability of the BTI by screening all items for appropriateness with regard to content and comprehensibility. The results showed that the expected Big Five Structure was found and that it replicated well across different cultural groups in South Africa.

2.9 The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI)

Cheung and colleagues set out to develop an indigenous personality structure and measurement instrument for the Chinese culture (the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory – CPAI) using a combined etic-emic approach (Cheung, Leung, Fan, Song, Zhang, & Zhang, 1996). The personality constructs included in the CPAI were derived from personality adjectives or person descriptions of everyday life. These constructs were derived from Chinese novels, Chinese proverbs, reviews of Chinese literature, and surveys among professional and ordinary people where they had to describe themselves and others. Systematic lexical research on Chinese personality has indicated that Chinese personality consists of seven factors (Cui & Wang, 2003), as opposed to the five of the FFM personality structure.

The main constructs were Dependability, Interpersonal Relatedness, Social Potency, and Individualism. Cheung et al. (1996) found indigenous sub-constructs (i.e. Family Orientation, Harmony, Face, Thrift vs. Extravagance, Relationship-Orientation, and Somatisation),
clustered under the label Interpersonal Relatedness, that could be construed as typical ‘non-Western’ traits (Cheung, Cheung, Wada, & Zhang, 2003). This construct conveys the importance of social values in the Chinese, collectivistic culture. Cheung, Cheung, Wada, and Zhang (2003) revised the initial CPAI, with the first three constructs still being Dependability, Interpersonal Relatedness, and Social Potency, but with the last construct known as Accommodation. The revised version was known as the CPAI-2. The CPAI was revised to increase the clinical applicability of the scale (Van de Vijver & Van Hemert, 2008), and aesthetics was added in order to represent the Openness scales. Clinical factors were divided according to emotional problems and behavioural problems.

The CPAI structure showed good correspondence with the FFM of Costa and McCrae (1992), with Dependability, Social Potency, and Accommodation overlapping strongly with Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism, although the last construct, Openness to Experience was found to have the least representation in the Chinese culture (Cheung, 2006). As an indigenous factor, Interpersonal Relatedness showed little correspondence with the B5/FFM, making the assumption of the cultural-specific saliency in the Chinese culture. However, in a study done by Lin and Church (2004), the Interpersonal Relatedness factor was well represented in the Chinese American and European American groups, making the factor less indigenous and culture-specific for the Chinese cultures.

2.10 Conclusion

Understanding the personality of an individual has important implications in the development of interventions and assessment measures in the field of psychology. Within personality psychology, personality theories provide systems for describing, explaining and comparing people and their behaviors. The application of personality assessment techniques for clinical and personnel decisions has been a major activity for psychologists. However, cross-cultural differences in test results and gaps in cultural constructs in these measures have led to the need for indigenous tools in clinical assessment. The South African Personality Inventory (SAPI) project seeks to develop a single, unified personality inventory for South Africa that takes into consideration both universal and unique personality factors across the various cultural and language groups in South Africa. This study forms part of the initial phases of the bigger SAPI project.
Chapter 3

CROSS-CULTURAL TESTING AND TEST DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Chapter Preview

This chapter gives a definition of culture and provides an in-depth discussion on cross-cultural testing. A broad overview of cross-cultural research on personality measures follows. Finally the steps in developing psychometric tests will be examined. For the purpose of this research study the terms cross-cultural assessment and cross-cultural testing will be used interchangeably.

3.2 Contextual framework

Psychological testing in South Africa has mainly followed international trends in that at the beginning of the 1900s, tests were imported from abroad and applied in all sectors of the community (Foxcroft, 1997). Cross-cultural issues emerged in the 1920s, and in the 1940s and 1950s psychological testing focused on the educability and trainability of black South Africans (Meiring, van de Vijver, Rothmann & Barrick, 2005). Psychological testing in South Africa was originally initiated with white test-takers in mind (Huysamen, 2002). Tests were developed separately for Afrikaans- and English-speaking groups (Claassen, 1997), but excluded the speakers of African languages. Paradoxically, of the 44.8 million South Africans, 77.97% speak an indigenous African language as a home language, 13.34% speak Afrikaans as a home language, and a meager 8.20% of the South African population speaks English as a home language (Statistics South Africa, 2003).

A study conducted by Foxcroft, Paterson, le Roux, Herbst (2004) revealed that only a relatively small percentage of practitioners felt that the tests they were using were appropriate to use cross-culturally. In contrast to this, almost two-thirds (65.8%) of the respondents indicated that they felt that the tests that they use are only sometimes appropriate to use cross-culturally, while 11% of the respondents did not feel that any of the tests that they used were appropriate to use cross-culturally. It is therefore not surprising that the majority (58%) of practitioners indicated that more culturally appropriate tests are needed in South Africa. Of concern from the study is that none of the tests designed for use in South Africa by the
Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) have been developed or adapted within a multicultural context (Foxcroft et.al, 2004). According to Abrahams and Mauer (1999), members of historically disadvantaged groups in South Africa suffered similar patterns of discrimination as minority groups in the United States of America did in that they tended to be unfamiliar with the material used in western-oriented psychological tests. Occasionally, the same test with different norms was used for different population groups (Claassen, 1997).

The practice of using measures standardised for one group on another group, without investigating whether or not the measure might be biased or inappropriate for the other group, continued throughout the twentieth century in South Africa. However, some measures were developed specifically for the South African population in response to societal needs (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2001). The development of unbiased, culturally appropriate measures in the multicultural, multilingual South African society is faced with difficulties that have also slowed down the rate at which tests are being developed (Foxcroft, 1997). Developing tests that tap into aspects of behaviour common to various cultural groups is highly complex, because South Africa is not simply a multicultural society: it is a multicultural society in which acculturation of many kinds is taking place, and in which a new nationhood is actively encouraged by political authorities (Foxcroft, 1997).

Since the first democratic elections, held in 1994, the country has had a new constitution and stronger demands for the cultural appropriateness of psychological tests. This culminated in the promulgation of the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998. In Section 8 of the Act, (Government Gazette, 1998) it is stipulated that: Psychological testing and other similar assessments of an employee are prohibited unless the test or assessment being used:

(a) has been scientifically shown to be valid and reliable;
(b) can be applied fairly to all employees; and
(c) is not biased against any employee or group.

The Employment Equity Act imposes very strict criteria on South African psychologists, as they have to indicate that their measuring instruments adhere to the regulations of the Employment Equity Act and can be applied in a multicultural society. According to Foxcroft (1997), the practice of psychological testing in South Africa needs to be understood in terms of the impact that past apartheid political policies have had on test development use. The
users and developers of psychological tests face many challenges. Because of the impact of past apartheid policies on psychological test development and, in view of the multicultural and multilingual nature of the South African society, a more comprehensive code of fair testing practice is needed. Foxcroft (1997) further argues that there should be sensitivity about issues of fairness with regard to the influence of culture on test performance.

Test users will just have to start accepting the fact that there is no quick solution in choosing and using psychological tests in the new South Africa (Abrahams, 1994). It would also appear that a balanced approach to test development is required by adapting and norming certain international measures and developing other new and culturally relevant measures (Foxcroft, 1997). Most countries in the world have some or other organization responsible for the development of psychometric instruments which can be used to advance the economic, social and educational welfare of their people (Owen, 1998). The psychological test divisions of the HSRC were brought into being for the purpose of developing tests in a South African context. However, since the advent of democracy the HSRC has been restructured and it is currently not involved in psychological test development at all. Although the Professional Board for Psychology has established a Psychometrics Committee to oversee psychological testing, it has failed to establish a national test development, adaptation and revision agenda to drive and coordinate test development efforts.

A scathing attack on testing in South Africa came from Nzimande, an ANC MP and Chairperson of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Education. In a paper read at a psychometrics conference, he asserted inter alia the following:

- Testing in South Africa has been fundamentally shaped by apartheid.
- Testing in South Africa developed within the context of national, racial and gender oppression. No matter how much psychologists might have thought that they were practicing their ‘science’ of testing …, the fact of the matter is that this was not possible in a society that could be characterized as ‘unethical’.
- The constitution and government are committed to affirmative action as an instrument to redress past historical imbalances. The key question facing psychometrics is the analysis of the meaning of affirmative action for testing (Nzimande, 1995, p.8).
In line with Nzimande’s views, the Green Paper on Employment and Occupational Equity (1996) stated that “Employers should avoid psychometric tests unless they can demonstrate that they respect diversity” (p.35). Foxcroft (1997) cautions that test users and developers need to guard against affirmative action policies not impacting on the ethical use of tests. Policy makers need to be made aware that affirmative assessment cannot and should not be used to redress the imbalances of the past.

3.3 Defining culture

According to Roshan Cultural Heritage Institute (2001) culture is a definition highly misunderstood and misused, and thus needs to be explored: They define culture in the following domains:

- **Language**: the oldest human institution and the most sophisticated medium of expression.
- **Arts & Sciences**: the most advanced and refined forms of human expression.
- **Thought**: the ways in which people perceive, interpret, and understand the world around them.
- **Spirituality**: the value system transmitted through generations for the inner well-being of human beings, expressed through language and actions.
- **Social activity**: the shared pursuits within a cultural community, demonstrated in a variety of festivities and life-celebrating events.
- **Interaction**: the social aspects of human contact, including the give-and-take of socialization, negotiation, protocol, and conventions.

Bamgbose (1994, p.98) identifies culture as “an intertwined system of values and attitudes, beliefs and norms that give meaning and significance to both individual and collective identity”. It becomes probable then that the intrusion of a person’s culture into an environment where the norms of another person’s culture are expected would hinder communication across cultural boundaries. Culture is not like any other variable because it comprises the context for the operation of all the other variables (Dana, 2000). In his model Dana (2000) maintains that culture plays a centralized role in understanding behaviour.
Much of our behaviour is shared and learned behaviour is transmitted from one generation to the next. Culture plays a significant role in cross-cultural assessment. Whenever tests developed in one culture are used with another culture there is the potential for misinterpretation unless cultural issues are considered. In an attempt to understand human behaviour in a cultural context, there are two general orientations with respect to defining our starting point in understanding people in different cultures:

3.4 The emic and the etic approaches

Both these theoretic viewpoints are valid and essential, but each has its limitations. The emic-etic problem is a pervasive one inherent to any comparison of cultural groups or cultures. There is no preferred strategy and both approaches can be justified on the basis of the nature of the data and goals of the study (Kazarian & Evans, 1998).

3.4.1 The emic approach

The emic approach seeks to understand a given culture on its own terms without reference to the other cultures or perspectives.

3.4.2 The etic approach

This view emphasizes the universal and compares cultures along similar dimensions, seeking to determine whether data or theories developed in one culture are appropriate for another. Etic approaches, though providing intercultural comparisons, may inappropriately impose the same categories of comparisons across groups (Kazarian & Evans, 1998).

3.5 Cross-cultural assessment

Cross-cultural assessment is the evaluation of behaviour and attributes by obtaining measures of these under different cultural conditions and by comparing them in order to establish cross-cultural uniformities and differences. Knowledge of these uniformities can be used to develop a theory of human behaviour across cultures, while knowledge of differences makes us aware of variations caused by the influence of different cultural conditions (Van Ede, 1996). Comparative studies across ethnic groups and cultures attempt to reveal discrepancies among
human beings and thus try to achieve a better understanding of humankind. Present day researchers in this field label their research as transcultural, cross-national, cross-cultural, or cross ethnic (Van Rooyen, 1989). A dilemma for these comparative studies is to compile measures that do not discriminate against individuals from different cultural groups.

Certain individuals may not have been exposed in their ethnic, cultural or subcultural group to the issues required by the measure. The comparison of people from different cultural groups has become an important part of behavioural science (Manaster & Havighurst, 1972). Baron and Byrne (1994) agree that efforts to understand social behaviour must take careful account of cultural factors. Attention to the effects of cultural factors is an increasingly important trend in modern social psychology.

According to Anastasi and Urbina (1997) the problem associated with testing people who have highly dissimilar cultural backgrounds was recognized in the United States as early as 1910 when large groups of immigrants had to be tested. The issue of cross-cultural assessment has received increasing attention since the middle of the 20th century when assessment measures were needed in newly developed nations in Africa and elsewhere to decide on admission to educational facilities and for individual counselling. In the development or adaptation of a measure to be used in cross-cultural research, it is important to consider both similarities and differences between different cultures.

3.5.1 Cultural Similarities

According to Manaster and Havighurst (1972) there are a number of factors, apart from biological drives and biological and cognitive growth that contribute to behavioural similarities among people. Allan (1992) and Van Rooyen (1989) reported that these factors include the following:

3.5.1.1 Family Experience

The experience of growing up in a family causes the child to learn a set of attitudes and expectations about others. The similarity of attitudes and expectations lead to behavioural similarities. The differences in family experience are small in comparison to the broad similarities among societies at the same level of social evolution.
3.5.1.2 Socio-economic factors

The experience of growing up in a particular social class leads to behavioural similarities. A member of a specific social class will generally share certain attitudes towards certain matters, such as occupational aspirations, with members of similar classes in other societies.

3.5.1.3 Common life experiences

Common life experiences in an urban industrial society may lead to common ways of behaving and believing. Common habits and attitudes may also develop.

Manaster and Havighurst (1972) concluded, after considering these similarities of human experience, that cultural differences among the most modern industrial and urban societies are not large. These similarities of human behaviour may have led to the expectation that measures of ability, intelligence and personality could be applied to various cultural groups and then be interpreted in the same way as in the countries in which they were developed and validated. According to Manaster and Havighurst (1972) this belief was proven naïve when the interpretation of projective tests administered to people of non-western cultures provided unconvincing results and psychologists realized that cultural aspects had to be considered in the interpretation of psychological assessment measures.

3.5.2 Cultural differences

Cultural differences exist among people in different societies despite their many similarities. Behaviour, including for example, religious beliefs and practices, moral and ethical attitudes, the predominant language spoken and so forth, are influenced by the cultural setting in which the individual is raised. Cultural influences can therefore be expected to reflect in test performances and outcomes (Allan, 1992). According to Manaster and Havighurst (1972) there are a number of cultural factors that could affect test performance. These theorists stated that cultural groups are likely to differ on many psychological measures because they differ systematically from one another regarding the issues outlined below:
3.5.2.1 Experience with the stimulus

In developed and “highly psychologized” nations, the typical citizen is familiar with many test-taking practices, for example, the desirability of optimum performances on measures of ability, or honest responses on psychological measures. However, for many persons in developing nations, expected test behaviours should not be assumed since assessment is not part of the cultural landscape (Lonner, 1990). Steps must therefore be taken to ensure that all participants are working under the same set of assumptions and expectations about the assessment.

The content and the nature of the assessment will not necessarily be equally familiar to people from different cultural groups. Certain items in an assessment measure may require the understanding of a particular word, place or object. Such items would not be suitable in a measure that is to be applied in another culture where the objects or terms are unfamiliar. Questions asked during the interview and questions on assessment measures may be answered differently in different cultures. While certain cultures would consider a direct question an easy and efficient method of eliciting an answer, other cultures would consider certain direct questions as impolite, for example.

3.5.2.2 Motivation with respect to the assessment

According to Anastasi and Urbina (1997) emotional and motivational factors also influence test performance and outcomes. Motivational factors include intrinsic interest of the test content, rapport with the examiner, the desire to perform well, and problem solving habits. The tempo of daily life, the motivation to hurry, and the value attached to rapid performance may vary widely among different cultural groups. These factors may differ among individuals, and possibly more so among different cultural groups. It may be necessary to encourage participants to do their best by explaining how their participation will benefit themselves or society.

3.5.2.3 Experiences with the language

All human beings constantly express themselves through verbal and non-verbal language. These forms of communication are used to relay feelings, intentions, personality, and needs
According to Moore and Levitan (1993), people also use verbal and non-verbal expressions to link themselves with others, typically communicating with others with whom they share a common understanding of meaning.

Differences that exist between various cultures and language groups are a function of not only the different traditions, norms and values, but of different worldviews and interpretations as well (Hambleton, 1994). Different cultural groups may attribute different meanings to commonly used expressions. Respondents from one cultural or ethnic group will therefore differ to other cultural or ethnic groups in their performance to the extent that they are familiar with the questionnaire’s language as well as expressions associated with that language.

3.5.2.4 Cultural differences in developmental experience

Differences due to developmental experiences associated with a certain culture account for major differences between cultural groups. For example, the social expectations for behavior appropriate to sons are different from those for daughters. Sex-role differences may also vary among certain cultures. Furthermore, children are exposed to different educational and training approaches across cultural and ethnic groups. The interaction of the above-mentioned factors needs to be taken into account when comparing the questionnaire results of different cultural or ethnic groups. Hambleton (1994) agrees:

There are many factors which affect cross-cultural /language comparisons which need to be considered whenever two or more groups from different language/cultural backgrounds are compared, especially when an instrument is being developed or adapted, or scores are being interpreted. However, often it is necessary that some of these factors are not merely taken into account, but that practical steps be taken to either minimize or eliminate the likely (unwanted) effects of these factors on any cross-cultural/ language comparisons that are made (p. 233-234).

According to Foxcroft (2002), practitioners involved in psychological testing in the culturally and linguistically diverse African continent are faced with a challenge of how best to cater for
this diversity so as to be sensitive to the cultural backgrounds and values of those they are testing. Testing is a Westernized activity that cannot always be transferred to non-Westernized cultures. Psychological testing was brought to Africa in the colonial era, and it is not something that is indigenous to Africa and its peoples (Foxcroft, 2002). Given differing levels of literacy and education, ‘taking a test’ is not something that is necessarily within the daily experience of many people in Africa. The impact that a lack of testwiseness can have on test-takers can be reduced by ensuring that they are thoroughly prepared for the experience.

3.6 Methodological and Theoretical issues in Cross-Cultural Testing

Several methodological and theoretical issues that need to be considered in order to produce a personality inventory that is acceptable across language, gender, and cultures in terms of its psychometric characteristics will be discussed below (Foxcroft, 2002; Shuttleworth-Jordan, 1996)

- **Adopt an emic approach** - The emic view seeks to understand a given culture in its own terms without reference to the other cultures or perspectives. If language proves to be a barrier, interpreters may be used. When interpreters are used, they should be trained in the nature of interviewing and psychological measurement and should have a clear understanding of their role.

- **When psychological testing is to be conducted as part of a research project**, permission often needs to be gained from appropriate government and community bodies. Also, assessment practitioners will need to motivate why the testing needs to be undertaken and how the community will benefit from the research project.

- **Whether the testing forms part of a research project or as part of psychological service provision**, obtaining **informed consent** is central to conducting the testing in an ethical way.

- **In the interests of upholding ethical testing practices**, it is always advisable to conduct testing in test-takers familiar surroundings. Ideally, psychological tests should be strongly related to the context (society, culture) in which they are intended.
• **Socio-cultural differences** (i.e., factors such as primary language, current language usage, socioeconomic status, preschool socialization experiences, levels of education, and test sophistication) are to be taken into account as these are frequently associated with racial differences, and are known to account for significant variations in test performance.

• **Test bias** may occur when the contents of the test are more familiar to one group than to another or when the tests have differential predictive validity across groups (Fouad, 1994). Bias occurs if score differences on the indicators of a specific construct do not relate to actual differences in the underlying trait (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997; Van de Vijver & Leung, 2001). A distinction can be made between three different types of bias, namely construct bias, method bias, and item bias.

**Construct Bias**

Construct bias occurs when the psychological construct measured is not identical across cultural groups, indicating that the construct is poorly represented (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997b). Van de Vijver and Tanzer (1997) suggest that the best way to deal with construct bias is to specify the theoretical conceptualisation behind the measure, thereby ensuring that the definitions of the constructs are consistent across the cultural groups. To control for construct bias, a procedure called decentring could be used. This entails the simultaneous development of an instrument for different cultures (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997).

**Method Bias**

Method bias occurs when the assessment process introduces between-group differences, such as a change in the mean score of a cultural group, that are sometimes interpreted as cross-cultural differences when they are in fact measurement artefacts (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2001). There are three kinds of method bias, namely sample bias, instrument bias, and administration bias.
• *Sample bias*

Sample bias, is attributed to a difference between the samples on a variable other than the target variable, for example education, race, gender and/or home language (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997).

• *Instrument bias*

The second kind of method bias has to do with the test characteristics and is known as instrument bias. Instrument bias could be due to response sets, stimulus familiarity, and response procedures (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997). The response sets of acquiescence and social desirability are of particular concern here. Acquiescence is the systematic tendency to answer “true” (or “false”), no matter what the content of the item (Lanyon & Goodstein, 1997). This is often dealt with by having an equal number of positively and negatively keyed items in a scale. However, when the items are subjected to a factor analysis, the negatively keyed items could load on a separate factor to the positively keyed items, which is problematic.

Socially desirable responding occurs when a respondent unwittingly responds in a way that portrays them in the best possible light. This can be distinguished from deliberate faking (Lanyon & Goodstein, 1997), where a respondent intentionally tries to make himself or herself look good, possibly for job selection purposes (McCrae, 1997). Furthermore, if the measure is administered in the second language of the participant, negatively keyed items are sometimes found to be difficult and confusing, leading to incorrect responses. Consequently it might be wisest in cross-cultural assessment to word the items positively and to rather check the answer sheet to see whether it must be discarded as being invalid as the participant has tended to largely respond in the same manner to all the items.

• *Administration bias*

The last type of method bias is administration bias, which is a result of the procedural aspects of test administration. Lack of standardisation of administration, interviewer effects, and poor instructions can all lead to administration bias.
Item Bias

Item bias is otherwise known as *differential item functioning (DIF)*. This type of bias occurs when there are anomalies in the measure on item level, perhaps caused by poor translation or inappropriate items in a particular context, which could lead to items having a different psychological meaning across cultures (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997b). Item bias can be explored and reduced using statistical or judgmental techniques, such as item response theory, multidimensional scaling or analysis of variance.

Equivalence

Equivalence refers to the effects of bias on the comparability of constructs and test scores across cultural groups (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2001). Basically, equivalence can be said to be a “lack of bias”, and is usually regarded from a measurement-level perspective (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997). There are three different types of equivalence, namely structural (construct) equivalence, measurement equivalence, and scalar (full scale) equivalence.

- **Structural Equivalence**

Structural (construct) equivalence implies that there is a similarity in the psychometric properties of data sets from different cultures. In other words, if equal factor structures are obtained for two different cultural groups, it is assumed that the psychological construct being measured by the instrument is the same in both groups. However, it does not imply that the origin or units of measurement of the instrument are identical for both groups (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997b).

- **Measurement Unit Equivalence**

Measurement unit equivalence, as the name suggests, means that the unit of measurement of an instrument is the same for two different cultures, but the origin is different. This means that the differences between two scores may be compared within and across cultures, but the
scores themselves may only be reliably compared within cultures (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997b).

- **Scalar Equivalence**

Scalar equivalence means that scores have an identical unit of measurement as well as a common origin. This allows for scores to be compared within and across cultural groups. It often occurs that studies claim scalar equivalence of a measure when only construct equivalence has been established (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997a). Van de Vijver and Leung (1997a) pointed out that equivalence is often merely assumed in most empirical studies, which is not sufficient as a point of departure for comparison between cultural groups. They insist that in order to compare the factorial structure of two groups, a level of equivalence needs to be established. Van de Vijver and Leung (1997a) stated that exploratory factor analysis, followed by target rotation and a computation of an index of factorial agreement, is one of the most commonly used means of establishing construct equivalence. Alternatively, structural equation modeling could be used.

Reliability

The reliability of a psychological test is an indication as to the amount of measurement error present in a test. Tests that are relatively free of measurement error can be deemed reliable (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2001).

Validity

Kaplan and Saccuzzo (2001) defined validity as the agreement between a test score and the quality it is believed to measure. In other words, the validity of a test score is an indication of the degree to which it reaches its goal. The two types of validity relevant to the present study will be described below, namely content validity and construct validity.
• **Content Validity**

Content-related evidence for validity is considered to be how well a construct is represented by the items (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2001). In other words, the items fully represent what is supposed to be measured, and no irrelevant items are included. This type of validity evidence is usually established by a panel of experts. A type of content validity is substantive validity. The substantive validity of a test is the extent to which the test is judged to be reflective of, or theoretically linked to, some construct of interest. It is essential for establishment of the instrument’s construct validity; therefore, instruments that do not have sufficient substantive validity cannot have sufficient construct validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991).

• **Construct Validity**

Construct-related validity is a measure of how well a test measures the construct it is supposed to measure. A construct is an abstract concept, and is therefore very difficult to quantify. Obtaining construct validity evidence for a test is usually done by defining the construct to be measured, developing the instrument to measure it, and assembling the evidence as to what the test actually means (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1991). With special regard to the five-factor model of personality, Block (1995) highlighted issues surrounding the use of factor analysis that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of such analyses. Block (1995) indicated that the amount of variance accounted for by a single factor does not necessarily represent the psychological importance of the factor.

3.7 **Culture-free or culture-fair tests**

Foxcroft (1985) stated that no individual measure is likely to be equally fair to every cultural group and that existing cultural measures should not be viewed as being interchangeable. Rather, they should be recognised as assisting in supplying various types of cross-cultural comparisons. Anastasi and Urbina (1997) also stated that a more realistic approach to the construction of tests intended for cross-cultural purposes would be to put emphasis on experiences that are common to different cultural groups. This resulted in the term *culture-free* tests being replaced with *cross-cultural, culture-fair, or culture-common* tests.
3.7.1 Characteristics of culture-common tests

Manaster and Havighurst (1972) have proposed that a “culture-common test has the following characteristics:

- it taps aspects of cultural experience which are common to all people to whom the test will be administered. Examples of such common aspects are family situations, language, common objects in the everyday experience, and number systems;
- it is designed to have virtually the same degree of intrinsic interest for the different cultural groups to whom it will be administered; and
- it uses a form of language which is widely familiar, and the directions are stated in simple, operational terms which are easily understood.

Van Rooyen (1989) believed that it is highly unlikely that any one measure could be developed that would include all these characteristics if it was to be administered cross-culturally or cross-ethnically. Frijda and Jahoda (1966) anticipated two major problems with culture-common instruments: a) that outside designers of culture-common measures would have insufficient knowledge of the cultural groups concerned; and b) that comparability would be based on intuitive judgement rather than objective standardisation.

3.7.2 Developing culture-common tests

It needs to be kept in mind that the South African society has a diversity of cultures in which appreciation for the culture of origin exists alongside variations in acculturation towards a Western norm (Claassen, 1997). In view of the varying cultural distances between cultures and subcultures in South Africa and the influence that culture exerts on behaviour (and hence test performance), Claassen (1997, p. 306) asserts that a “realistic objective in cross cultural testing is rather to construct tests that presuppose only experiences that are common to different cultures”.

To this, Retief (1992) adds that not only should multicultural tests yield an index of commonality but also an index of difference. By this is meant that a multicultural test could have two components. One that taps aspects of the construct that are common across cultures
and one that taps aspects of the construct that are unique to each group. The former could be used when cross-cultural comparisons are made, while the latter can be used to get a fuller, more culturally contextualised picture of the individual being assessed.

Consequently, if the fact that the test being developed for a multicultural context is written into the test plan, the test developer will be alerted to the fact that the test plan will also have to include ways of identifying aspects of the construct that are common to and unique to the various groups included.

Within this context, Butcher and Garcia (1978) identified test translation and test adaptation as two main problems associated with cross-national testing. Two basic methods for test adaptation have been identified: forward translation and back-translation.

In forward translation, the original test in the source language is translated into the target language and then bilinguals are asked to compare the original version with the adapted version (Hambleton, 1993; 1994).

In back-translation, the test is translated into the target language and then it is re-translated back to the source language. This process can be repeated several times. Once the process is complete, the final back-translated version is compared to the original version (Hambleton, 1994). Each of these adaptation processes has its strengths and limitations.

Adapting an existing instrument instead of developing a new one has both advantages and disadvantages. By adapting an instrument, the researcher is able to compare the already-existing data with newly acquired data, thus allowing for cross-cultural studies both at a national and an international level. Adaptations also can conserve time and expenses (Hambleton, 1993). Test adaptation can lead to increased fairness in assessment by allowing individuals to be assessed in the language of their choice (Hambleton & Kanjee, 1995).

A disadvantage of adaptation includes the risk of imposing conclusions based on concepts that exist in one culture but may not exist in the other. There are no guarantees that the concept in the source culture exists in the target culture (Lonner & Berry, 1986). Another disadvantage of adapting existing tests for use in another culture is that if certain constructs measured in the original version are not found in the target population, or if the construct is
manifested in a different manner, the resulting scores can prove to be misleading (Hambleton, 1994). Despite the difficulties associated with using adapted instruments, this practice is important because it allows for greater generalizability and allows for investigation of differences among a growing diverse population. Once the test has been adapted, test equivalence must be determined.

3.8 Cross-cultural research on personality measures

Research by Abrahams (1996) on the cross-cultural comparability of the Sixteen Personality Factor Inventory (16PF) found little support for the construct equivalence of the 16PF across the different cultural groups in South Africa. Individuals whose first language was not English experienced problems with the comprehensibility of the items. It was concluded that the 16PF was not suitable as an instrument in the South African multicultural context.

In a study conducted by Meiring (2000) using the Sixteen Personality Factor Inventory (16PF), significant mean differences between racial groups surfaced along with low levels of internal consistency among black respondents, which he attributed to the fact that blacks either did not understand the test items or gave a different meaning to a test item.

In another study conducted by Abrahams (2002) to challenge the continued usage of the 16PF in South Africa, it was found that the use of this test was biased against black mother-tongue speakers in the South African context. Despite these limitations, the 16PF remains the most widely used test in South Africa (Foxcroft, Paterson, LeRoux & Herbst, 2004).

A feasibility study was conducted on the 16PF5 by Van Eeden, Taylor, and Du Toit (1996) to determine its reliability and validity for different cultural groups in South Africa. It was concluded that the African language group might not understand some of the words and phrases being used or that this group might attach a different meaning to some words/phrases.

Following this study Prinsloo, Van der Watt, Van der Berg, Claassen, Ebersohn, Magungo and Naidoo (1998) studied the measurement equivalence as well as the effect of language proficiency on personality profiles in the South African English version of the 16PF5. The sample comprised first-year students at the Rand Afrikaans University (RAU) who shared cultural origins and who had English or Afrikaans, and in some cases, an African language as
a mother tongue. It was found that these students could complete the English questionnaires fairly easily. Prinsloo et al. (1998) concluded that the South African English version of the 16PF5 is valid in terms of its constructs and does not show any great extent of differential item functioning in terms of sub-groups based on gender and home language.

Van Eeden and Prinsloo (1997) conducted a study on the second-order factors of the 16PF, SA92, using 637 applicants for posts at a multi-cultural business institution. A cultural distinction was made using home language as a basis, and the sample comprised 317 subjects with an African language as a home language and 320 English- or Afrikaans-speaking subjects. They concluded that separate norms should be used for different population groups in specific occupational contexts, and that certain cultural and gender-specific trends needed to be taken into account when interpreting results on the test.

Abrahams (1997) has similar concerns with regard to the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, South African 1992 version (16PF, SA92). According to Abrahams and Mauer (1999a, 1999b) the 16PF (Form SA92) does not function properly for Black respondents, which could affect the applicability or interpretation of their results on this test. This can have important ramifications in educational, clinical, and occupational settings.

Prinsloo and Ebersohn (2002) responded to Abrahams and Mauer’s (1999a, 1999b) studies on the 16PF, highlighting methodological issues and the need for differential interpretation of test scores across cultures. The authors stressed that “high” or “low” scores obtained on the 16PF do not mean “good” or “bad”, rather that in certain situations, more or less of a given personality construct could be desirable.

A replication of Abrahams and Mauer’s (1999b) study on the impact of home language on responses to items on the 16PF was carried out by Wallis and Birt (2003). A sample of 96 indigenous English-speaking and 35-non-indigenous English speaking students were asked to give synonyms for the 135 words extracted from the 16PF in Abrahams and Mauer’s (1999b) study. Using the same methodology, Wallis and Birt (2003) found that most respondents could not provide correct synonyms for the words most of the time. However, when the responses were marked according to colloquial language usage (i.e. accepting Afrikaans translations, subtle synonyms, and everyday English meanings that are not technically correct, but mean the same thing), both groups seem to understand most words in the list.
According to Wallis and Birt (2003) this was an indication that the results obtained by in the original study were more a result of the methodology than language-related problems. It was recommended that studies using different methodologies should be undertaken in order to examine the extent to which language barriers are contributing to score differences.

Meiring, Van de Vijver, Rothmann and Barrick (2005) conducted a study to examine bias at construct and item level utilizing the Fifteen Factor Questionnaire Second Edition (15FQ+), an English spelling test and two cognitive instruments that measured reading and comprehension. The sample consisted of 13 681 applicants for jobs in the South African Police Services. The Black group made up 85% of the sample, and was representative of nine South African language groups. All applicants had a minimum of a Grade 12 educational qualification. Although the 15FQ+ demonstrated low item bias, the internal consistency reliability coefficients were unacceptably low for most of the scales, and evidence for construct bias was found for two of the factors. Meiring et al. (2005) concluded that the usefulness of the 15FQ+ was limited, and that certain semantic revisions of items needed to take place in order for the items to be more easily understood (e.g., the use of words such as “gullible”, “temperamental”, and “conventional” should be avoided). Van de Vijver, Rothmann and Barrick (2005) concluded that psychological measures from abroad, such as the 15FQ+, are not always sufficiently suited to the multicultural South African context.

Taylor and Boeyens (1991) investigated the South African Personality Questionnaire’s (SAPQ) construct comparability across culture groups using four samples of male students from various South African universities consisting of two Black samples and two White samples. They concluded that while there was some support for construct comparability between blacks and whites, analysis of item bias indicated that the questionnaire was not suitable for cross-cultural applicability. The authors recommended a clean-sheet approach which entails the creation of a new personality measure suitable for cross-cultural use in South Africa. Although Retief (1992) agrees that the SAPQ should not be used in a multicultural context, he points out that bias in the context of personality tests can also be useful if it is viewed as difference rather than as deficit.

The research by Heuchert (1998) on the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO-PI-R) is another example of efforts to investigate the possible impact of culture on the reliability and
validity of test results. A sample of 226 students completed the NEO-PI-R, and the results were then compared to those of the US normative sample for the questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Heuchert (1998) concluded that the NEO-PI-R could serve as a useful instrument for the assessment of personality in South Africa, and the standardisation and development of norms for the South African population should take place.

Heuchert, Parker, Strumf, and Myburg (2000) investigated the structure of the Five Factor Model of Personality (FFM) in South African university students. Four hundred and eight students (268 White, 92 Black, 43 Indian, and 5 Coloured) from two South African universities completed the NEO-PI-R. All subjects were included in the analysis of the factor structure, but the Coloured group and students older than 22 were dropped from the comparison of profiles between race groups. When the instrument was factor analyzed at the facet level with varimax rotation, the structure of the five-factor model was well reproduced for the entire sample as well as for the White and Black subgroups (Heuchert et al., 2000). Parallel analysis indicated the appropriateness of the five-factor solution. Whereas the structure of personality was highly similar across race, there were statistically significant differences in mean scores of some domains and facets by race. The greatest difference was in Openness to Experience, particularly in the Openness to Feelings facet, with the White subgroup scoring relatively high, the Black subgroup scoring relatively low, and the Indian subgroup scoring in an intermediate range. The authors speculate that these differences are primarily the result of social, economic, and cultural differences between the races rather than the direct product of race itself.

Horn (2000) examined a Xhosa translation of the NEO-PI-R. The author reported that translating the NEO-PI-R from English into Xhosa proved to be a lengthy and difficult process, in part because the Xhosa language has a restricted vocabulary with regard to personality descriptives. Some scales of the NEO-PI-R showed low internal consistency estimates.

Taylor (2000) conducted a construct comparability study of the NEO-PI-R for black and white employees in a working setting in South Africa. The NEO-PI-R did not work as well for blacks as it did for whites, in particular, the Openness factor was not found in the Black sample.
According to De Bruin (2005), attempts to isolate the Big Five factors among South Africans have yielded mixed (but mostly disappointing) results. These results may be attributed to the cultural inappropriateness of some of the items of imported questionnaires and the complexity of the item wordings.

In response to this, Taylor and de Bruin (2005) developed the Basic Traits Inventory (BTI) as an English language measure of the Five-Factor Model to be used across all ethnic groups in South Africa. The authors attempted to maximize the cross-cultural suitability of the BTI by screening all items for appropriateness with regard to content and comprehensibility, presenting the items in content blocks, avoiding reverse scored items, and clearly labeling the response categories of the five-point Likert type response scale. During analysis, the expected Big Five structure was found and it was also found out that the structure could be replicated across different cultural groups in South Africa.

It is evident from the aforementioned research studies that the personality tests used in South Africa are not suitable for the country’s multicultural and multilingual society. Even the adaptation of tests in South Africa, has not come without problems. It therefore makes sense that a team of experts from around South Africa plan to develop a new measure by first understanding how personality is viewed and described in different cultural groups. The course of action to be followed in establishing such an indigenous measure will be covered in greater detail in the next chapter.

3.9 Chapter Summary

Personality testing remains a huge challenge among the assessment professionals in South Africa. Most of the personality measures employed have various limitations when used on clients from different cultural and language groups found in the country. There is a dire need for locally developed personality measures in order to rise up to the challenge of performing ethically and culturally sound assessment.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH PROBLEM

4.1 Chapter Preview

This chapter provides a rationale for initiating this present study. A background to the SAPI project and the steps which the SAPI project team identified for the data cleaning phases are explained. Lastly, the research aims are outlined.

4.2 Contextualising the Research Problem

Over the last decade there has been a growing interest in the measurement of personality traits in applied settings, such as in selection, placement, therapeutic intervention and counselling (Bergh & Theron, 2003; Furnham, 1994; Richard, 2000). Personality testing in South Africa is largely carried out by means of imported personality instruments, which can prove costly and are not always valid for the South African population. A few of these questionnaires have been revised for use in South Africa, however it has been the case that in these revisions certain population groups have been underrepresented in sampling (Taylor & Boeyens, 1991; Van Eeden & Prinsloo, 1997) or the meaning of items in the questionnaires are understood differently by different cultures (Retief, 1992).

As was discussed in Chapter 3, personality tests continue to be used in South Africa despite the fact that comparatively few studies have been conducted on the comparability of the results of different cultural groups (Van de Vijver & Rothmann, 2004). Ethically and legally, it is improper to use many of the existing instruments, as they are either imported or not standardised for the South African population, or have only been standardised mainly on the White South African population. Currently, none of the available personality questionnaires used in South Africa have been found to provide a reliable and valid picture of personality for all cultural (language) groups, despite the obvious societal need for such an instrument.

Most of the instruments used for the measurement of personality have been adopted from elsewhere and there is an urgent need for the development of personality measuring instruments that can be fairly used for all the cultural and language groups (Meiring, Van de
Vijver, Rothmann, & Barrick, 2005). According to Owen (1991) and Maree (2000), the majority of South Africans regard the use of separate tests for different cultural groups as both unethical and unacceptable and it makes cross-cultural comparisons impossible. Hence, an urgent need exists in the country for development of personality measures that can be fairly used for all the cultural and language groups (Meiring, Van de Vijver, Rothman, & Barrick, 2005).

A study to what extent South African personality shows both universal and culturally specific factors has never been studied systematically. A new South African personality inventory to be developed should be applicable in a fair, equitable manner and should show predictive validity in various applied settings and should show as little adverse impact as possible.

As was discussed in Chapter 3, a fundamental question for psychologists interested in the measurement of personality and culture is whether personality traits are universal or culture-specific. The cross-cultural generalisability of personality characteristics has most often been investigated using an imposed etic approach (Berry, 1969), which implies that assessment instruments developed in Western countries were adopted in other cultural contexts, assuming that the underlying theories and constructs are universal (Berry, 1989; Church, & Lonner, 1998). According to Church and Lonner (1998, p. 36), the imposed etic strategy may “optimize the chances of finding cross-cultural comparability and exclude culture-specific dimensions”.

An obvious example of the use of the imposed etic approach is the growing number of studies investigating the cross-cultural replicability of the dimensions of the “Big Five” or five-factor model (FFM). However, in the past two decades there has been a move towards the development of indigenous personality measures which was initiated by some psychologists in non-Western countries (Cheung & Leung, 1998). The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI) is such an indigenous personality test developed by Chinese psychologists in mainland China and Hong Kong, which provides a means to complement the predominance of Western measures (Cheung, Cheung, Leung, Ward, & Leong, 2003).

It has become one of the main goals of the assessment profession in South Africa to bring current practice in line with ethical and Employment Equity demands, for example, by developing new measures and validating existing instruments for use in multicultural groups.
(Van de Vijver & Rothmann, 2004). It is against this background that the SAPI project was initiated with the aim of developing a new South African personality inventory (Meiring, 2006). The present study represents part of the first step of a larger project that aims to develop a single, unified personality inventory that can be utilized fairly by all eleven cultural (language) groups existing in South Africa.

4.3 The South African Personality Inventory (SAPI) Project

A research team comprising of principal investigators namely; Prof Deon Meiring (Independent Researcher, University of Stellenbosch), Prof Ian Rothmann (North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus), and Prof Fons van de Vijver (Tilburg University, the Netherlands, and North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus) as well as other investigators including Prof Deon de Bruin (Johannesburg University), Prof Cheryl Foxcroft (Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University) and Prof Callie Theron (University of Stellenbosch) have collaborated to initiate the development of a single, unified personality inventory that takes into consideration both universal and unique personality factors to be found across the eleven official language groups found in South Africa (Meiring, 2006). The personality inventory will be developed, standardized and submitted for classification to the Psychometrics Committee of the Professional Board for Psychology (HPCSA) in South Africa. The research team combines all the knowledge and skills needed for the successful completion of the project such as knowledge of cross-cultural assessment, personality theory, and sensitivity for and knowledge of the cultural differences in South Africa. The envisaged personality inventory will have to comply with the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998, Section 8 (Government Gazette, 1998) which stipulates:

“Psychological testing and other similar assessments of an employee are prohibited unless the test or assessment being used a) has been scientifically shown to be valid and reliable; b) can be applied fairly to all employees; and c) is not biased against any employee or group.”
The overall structure of the larger SAPI project involves the following stages:

1) The conducting of a structured interview to identify personality factors in a sample of South Africans from each official language group. The current study forms part of the first stage of the larger project. The researcher conducted the interviews with a Xhosa-speaking sample to reflect the personality factors identified for this South African language group against existing theories of personality.

2) The synthesis of all the personality factors identified and the subsequent development of a single measure that has a core of items that are common for all groups and, if needed, a set of language-specific items;

3) Translated versions of the measure will be developed for the various language groups. Thereafter, for standardization and norming purposes the measure will be administered to all language groups.

The SAPI project draws on the work that was done by Cheung, Leung, Fan, Song, Zang and Zang (1996) when they developed an indigenous personality measure in China called the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory. A combined emic-etic approach was adopted to include both indigenous and universal personality constructs that would be relevant to describing personality characteristics and predicting behaviors in the Chinese cultural context. The SAPI project aims to add insights to the debate on universality and cultural specificity of personality. The overall aim of the SAPI project is to develop a comprehensive inventory to assess personality in all official South African language groups. Practically speaking, this means that, an attempt will be made not to start from a well-known conceptualization of personality, but rather to start from everyday conceptualization of personality as found in South African language groups (Vijver, Meiring, Rothmann, de Bruin & Foxcroft, 2006).

The researcher then compared the findings from this study with existing personality theories and personality research in general, as well as in relation to Xhosa-speaking people. An attempt was also made to establish whether there are any relationships between the personality factors identified and current models of personality.
To date, the following mini-dissertations have been completed in the SAPI project:

Ntsieni (2006) conducted a study to determine the implicit perspectives of personality in Tshivenda-speaking (sometimes known as Vhavhenda) South Africans. Among all the personality characteristics sociability received the most personality descriptors (223), followed by loving (207) and religious (172), kind, friendly and understanding had an equal number of responses (155). According to Ntsieni (2006) most of the personality descriptors obtained in the study clearly indicate that the Tshivenda speaking people are very devoted to interpersonal relations, and they are also sociable, and helpful. The results of the study also suggest that helpfulness, love and care for others, a strong sense of purpose and high levels of inspiration are highly valued among the Tshivenda-speaking people.

Swanepoel (2006) conducted a similar study among Tsonga-speaking people in South Africa. The results of the study revealed that Emotional Stability, Caring, Helpful, Hard working, Advising, Generous, Traditional, Aggression, Recreational, Substance use, Religious, Sociable and Loving were the most prevalent personality descriptors. It became apparent that relationships and the way in which Tsonga-speaking South Africans interact is an important part of the culture. Based on the results of this study, the Tsonga culture can also be regarded as a social culture. They generally enjoy engaging in social activity, with only a few responses indicating that a person of this culture does not take pleasure in the company others.

In a similar study Kruger (2006) also conducted a study among Sesotho-speaking individuals to find out their implicit perspectives of personality. The majority of personality descriptors obtained from participants in the study clearly indicate that the Sesotho-speaking individuals are willing to become involved in the feelings, problems and welfare of others. The collectivistic nature of Sothos was apparent from the study. The personality characteristics extroversion, relationship orientation and family orientation rated high and clearly indicate the importance of relationships to Sesothos.

Among the Ndebele speakers de Beer (2007) a total of 151 personality descriptive facets were reduced from 4165 responses that were collected from the interviews. The most frequent facets were Loving (306 responses), Caring (160 responses), Talkative (132 responses), Religiosity (131 responses), Sociable (101 responses), Kind (100 responses) and
Hard-Working (94 responses). The 151 facets were then clustered together into nine broader constructs which are: Agreeable, Influential, Conscientious, Tough-minded, Intellectual/Open, Gregariousness, Emotional Stability, Self-absorbed and Relationship Harmony.

4.4 Research Aims

Within the context of the larger SAPI project, the primary aims of this study are:

- To explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speaking South Africans
- To explore and describe any possible relationship between personality factors that emerges for Xhosa-speakers and current models of personality.

The findings of this study will be synthesized with those obtained for other language groups to develop the structure of and items for the South African Personality Inventory (SAPI).

4.5 Summary

There is a need to develop a personality inventory that is cross-culturally applicable in the South African context. Given the multicultural nature of the South African society, assessment practitioners are faced with the challenge of performing assessments on clients from varied cultural backgrounds. There is increasing pressure on test developers and test users to guard against the potential misuse of psychological tests, and the need to adapt and develop culturally appropriate measures. Only psychological tests that have been proven to be scientifically valid and reliable and that are not biased against any groups may be used.
Chapter 5

Research Design and Methodology

5.1 Chapter Preview

To enable the researcher to explore and describe the personality factors identified for a Xhosa-speaking sample this chapter provides an overview of the research methodology employed in this study. The research design and the sampling procedure used are described. The measure will be briefly discussed. Finally, the process of the research will be elaborated upon, and methods of data analysis will be explained.

5.2 Research Method

A qualitative, exploratory, descriptive research approach was used in this study. Qualitative research attempts to describe and understand human behaviour, rather than explain it (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000), in qualitative research people can be studied in their natural environments. This research approach has to do with the exploration of opinions and attitudes of people. Qualitative data comes in the form of text, written words, phrases, or symbols describing or representing people, actions, and events in social life (Elmes, Kantowitz & Roediger 111, 1998). In contrast to quantitative research that relies on the use of statistics and measurements, qualitative research is naturalistic, participatory and interpretative (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The advantage of this type of method is that it provides more depth to the data obtained in contrast to a pure statistical approach. Qualitative methods are typically more flexible than quantitative research methods because they allow greater spontaneity and adaptation of the interaction between the researcher and the study participant.

An exploratory study is relevant since it serves as an exploration of a relatively unknown research area, that is, the conceptualisation of personality factors among Xhosa-speaking South Africans. Exploratory methods of research are used where little is known about the population or field of study. The purpose is therefore to explore and gather data, in order to build a foundation of ideas that can be used for further research (Grinell & Williams, 1990).
Descriptive research is considered the necessary first step in research, as it provides the groundwork for future research. Christensen (1994) defined descriptive research as an attempt to provide an accurate description or a picture of a particular situation or phenomenon. It attempts to identify variables that exist in a given situation, and at times, to describe the relationship between these variables. According to Mouton and Marais (1994, p34) the aims of exploratory and descriptive research methods are to:

- gain new insight into a phenomenon;
- undertake a preliminary investigation prior to conducting a more structured study of the phenomenon;
- elucidate the central concepts and constructs of the phenomenon;
- determine priorities for future research, and
- develop a new hypothesis about an existing phenomenon.

Furthermore, the purpose of this method was to explore and analyze the respondent’s description of behaviours and habits that are characteristic of different people that he/she interacts with. This study gathered data on, and explored the personality factors of a sample of Xhosa-speaking South Africans, thereby providing the groundwork for further South African studies on personality and the development of an indigenous personality measure. A cross-sectional survey method was used in which the idea was to draw a sample from a population at a single time, thus to obtain the desired research objectives (Bernard, 2000).

### 5.3 Participants and Sampling Method

A sample can be described as the part of the population that is studied so that the researcher can make generalizations about the whole of the original population (Russell & Roberts, 2001). Initially, we set out to conduct about 200 interviews per cultural group. It became clear during the interviews that a sample size of 100-120 per language group was enough to reach a saturation point. A sample size of 120 was obtained, although we were left with 95 due to the fact that some of the data collected from certain participants was deemed unusable at a later stage. In terms of sample size, 30 subjects are considered a minimum for an exploratory descriptive study. A non-probability, quota sampling method was used. In non-probability sampling there is no guarantee that each member of the population has a chance of being included, and no way to estimate the probability of each member’s possible
inclusion in the sample (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, Zechmeister &., 2001). In quota sampling, just as in stratified sampling, the population is first segmented into sub-groups. Then judgement is used to select the subjects from each sub-group based on a specified proportion. A stratified sampling method was used to divide the Xhosa speaking population into different categories (strata) according to age, gender and socio-economic status and the researcher then purposively identified specific individuals in each category for the research study.

Advantages of non-probability sampling include that it allows researchers to use their judgement in the selection of participants (Sudman, 1976; Whitley, 2002) and it is less complicated and less expensive than probability sampling. In addition, non-probability purposive sampling is most effective in narrowing down the sample to participants with the characteristics most representative of the target population. Disadvantages of this technique are that the probability that a person will be chosen is not known and the researcher generally cannot claim that the obtained sample is representative of the larger population (Babbie, 2005).

The characteristics of the participants are provided in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Characteristics of the participants (N=95)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older than 35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Economically Active (students, the disabled)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29,47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
57, 89% of the participants were females and 42, 11% were males. All the respondents were Xhosa-speaking and lived in the Eastern Cape Province. The majority of the participants fell into the 18-35 years age group (54, 74%), with the minority (45, 26) of the participants older than 35 years old. A further total of 49, 47% of the respondents were employed, while 21, 05% were unemployed and 29, 47% were not economically active (students, the disabled). The interviews were conducted in Alexandria and Port Elizabeth which are both urban areas. The interviewer tried to spread the interviews by interviewing people in suburbs, townships and informal settlements. The Eastern Cape remains the home of the Xhosa-speaking people of South Africa. According to Census 2007, approximately 83, 4% of the population in the Eastern Cape is Xhosa-speaking which suggests that the results yielded by the current study cannot be generalised for the rest of the Xhosa speaking people in South Africa.

5.4 Measures

5.4.1 The Biographical Questionnaire

The biographical questionnaire was designed by the South African Personality Instrument (SAPI) team. The information regarding each participant included the gender, age, highest level of education attained and economic activity of participants. The set of biographical questions can be found in Appendix A.

5.4.2 The Interview Questions

The researcher used unstructured interviews to obtain in-depth information about the respondent’s experience of description of typical aspects, habits and characteristics of different people. The same questions were posed to all participants in the bigger project. The questions that were asked during the structured interview were developed by the SAPI team. The type of questions asked aimed to elicit behaviour descriptions from the participants. Interviews were conducted among 120 Xhosa speaking participants. Two fieldworkers were initially involved in conducting the interviews but the one fieldworker withdrew after interviewing 25 participants due to relocating to Gauteng.
The participants were asked 10 open-ended questions which required them to describe the personalities of the following people:

a) a parent;
b) eldest child or eldest brother or sister;
c) a grandparent;
d) a neighbor;
e) a person you (the respondent) do not like;
f) best friend of the opposite sex (not including spouse);
g) a colleague or friend from another ethnic group;
h) the teacher you most preferred (if schooled), otherwise, person from the village/town whom you like very much;
i) the teacher that you least preferred (if schooled), otherwise, a person from the village/town whom you do not like at all;
j) best friend of the same sex.

The use of open-ended questions and probing gave participants the opportunity to respond in their own words, rather than forcing them to choose from fixed responses, as quantitative methods do. The following questions were utilized as probing questions:-

Please describe the following people to me by telling me what kind of person he or she is/was:

- Can you describe typical aspects of this person?
- Can you describe behaviours or habits that are characteristic of this person?
- How would you describe this person to someone who does not know him/her?

5.5 Ethical Considerations

Holloway (1997) states that ethical obligation with regards to testing rests with the researcher. The researcher explained to respondents the exact reason for the interview, why the interview needed to be recorded and what is intended with the findings of this research. The respondents were informed about their right to consent as well as their right to withdraw should they wish to do so. Informed consent means that individuals are entitled to full explanations at an understandable level of language, about why they are being interviewed,
how the research data will be used, what the results mean, and some information about the instrument itself (Allan, 1997; McIntire & Miller, 2000).

Participation in the study was voluntary. The interviews were only conducted with consenting adults. The interviewer interacted in a way that was as neutral and objective as possible to ensure that the data provided by respondents would not be contaminated. Validity and reliability were also ensured. According to Mouton and Marais (1990), reliability is influenced by, among other things, the researcher and the context or the circumstances under which the research is conducted. Reliability was ensured by making sure that interviews were conducted in a manner that was free from distraction. Clear instructions and explanations of the purpose of the study were given to ensure that appropriate information was collected and to encourage honest answers.

The interviewer established rapport to encourage the participants to share information. The participants could also express themselves freely, since they were using their mother tongue; this also helped in making sure that the exact meaning of what they wanted to share was not lost. Questions were also repeated without changing their meaning to ensure that participants understood them, and to make sure that the interview measured what it was purported to measure.

Participants’ responses were treated confidentially. Confidentiality in this context refers to the handling of information in a confidential manner. This refers to the researcher’s obligation to withhold information from third parties and to protect the participants’ identities at all costs (Cozby, 1993). The participant’s names were removed during the verification of translations by the language practitioner and through all the subsequent processes of data analysis. In publication of the findings, no names have been or will be linked to any responses. Anonymity and confidentiality can be maintained through carefully planned methods of coding that make the identification of information possible.

5.6 Research Procedure

Initially two Xhosa–speaking fieldworkers were trained in conducting semi-structured interviews by one of the principal researchers. This was done to ensure that a standard way of conducting the interviews would be followed across all the interviews and language groups.
Both fieldworkers were fluent Xhosa-speakers. Permission to conduct the interviews was first obtained from the participants after explaining to them the reasons for the study and why the interviews would be recorded. They were also informed about the issue of confidentiality, and who would have access to the records. The interviewers also took field notes during the interviews to ensure that accurate information was captured. Clarification of questions and responses were also given in order to avoid double meanings. The interviews were conducted using the respondents’ mother tongue, Xhosa. This made it easier for them to understand the questions, and it enabled them to express themselves freely.

5.7 Data Analysis

According to Mouton and Marais (1990), once the data has been generated, the researcher attempts to discover relationships or patterns by means of close scrutiny of data. Qualitative data analysis also requires that the large amount of data has to be reduced and interpreted. All SAPI researchers attended a workshop (“SAPI Data Cleaning Workshop”) which focused on the data cleaning and analysis phases of the SAPI sub-projects. First, the researcher captured all 120 interviews in an excel worksheet. The researcher transcribed the Xhosa interviews into English, which were in turn compared to field notes to ensure accurate recall of data. A Xhosa-speaking language expert was employed to ensure that correct translations were made from Xhosa to English without any loss of information.

The interviews were then reduced to descriptive words/phrases. The excel data sheet was scrutinized by a Xhosa-speaking language practitioner to refine and verify the translations into English. The reason that the interviews were translated into English is that, for the purposes of the bigger SAPI project, all the descriptive data obtained from participants in the different language groups needs to be available in one language for overall synthesis and analysis purposes. A new excel file with changes suggested by the Xhosa-speaking language expert was generated and handed over to the researcher. The themes were identified and clustered using the approach described below.

5.7.1 Preparation of data for content analysis

Content analysis was used to analyse, reduce and interpret the data obtained from the participants. The personality descriptors gathered from the interviews were plotted on an
Firstly, all verbs and tenses were made singular; for instance, “do” was converted to “does”, “like” to “likes” and “love” to “loves”. Past and present tense were not changed. The reason for modifying the data was to ensure that after the data were sorted, all homogeneous terms were grouped together. This also guaranteed that content analysis was more accurate and effective in the categorisation of the personality-descriptive terms.

Secondly, all superfluous words were deleted; for example, the sentence “he was always punctual” was coded as “punctual”.

Thirdly, all ambiguous terms were deleted; for example, “Unlike other girls” was not coded given the semantic ambiguity.

Fourthly, all non-personality terms were deleted; examples are physical characteristics such as “he was tall” or “she was my sister”. Two other widely used categories that were deleted referred to personal interests (for example, “he likes sports”) and the use of substances like tobacco and alcohol.

Fifthly, composite responses were split up; for example, “She is punctual and outgoing” was coded as two separate responses, “punctual” and “outgoing”. After all these modifications, descriptive terms were available in the data matrix.

The personality descriptors were interpreted and each descriptor was categorised into a personality dimension most relevant to the descriptor at hand. The broad personality dimensions obtained from the previous step were further categorised into refined clusters by grouping categories that were overlapping in meaning.

5.7.2 Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis refers to a classification technique used to form homogeneous groups within complex sets of data (Borgen & Barnett, 1985). The method organizes data into meaningful structures, reducing a set of complex data to its central features. According to Borgen and
Barnett (1985) cluster analysis is most often used as an exploratory technique to identify and structure subgroups that are of potential value in understanding the research problem. Cluster analysis was used for aim one of this study, which was to explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speaking South Africans.

### 5.7.2.1 Categorisation stage

The previous, more mechanical stage was followed by a more interpretive stage. Content analysis was applied in order to categorise the personality descriptive terms as facets. Resources that were often used in this stage were dictionaries, thesauruses, and literature. Also, the adequacy of each clustering was checked by comparing the verbalisations provided by the participants in order to ensure that the process of clustering did not lead to shifts in meaning. Personality-descriptive terms were intensely discussed in frequent group meetings between the collaborators of this project (some meetings were held in South Africa and in the Netherlands). This stage was regarded as the most important and sensitive in this qualitative study.

In many cases, persons were described in terms of characteristic behaviours. These descriptions (frequent in the African languages) were then categorised under the English term deemed most appropriate. For example, “He was angered easily” was classified as short-tempered, “She was never on time for meetings” was classified as punctual, and “She was always there for you when you need her” was classified as supportive.

Some personality-descriptive terms that were difficult to categorise were found. For example, when a person is described as a “good person” (which is a broad term), it is sometimes difficult to understand what the respondent meant. Is the person kind, loving, and caring or is the person morally conscious and honest? Might it be a combination of those facets, or is the reason for the person to be a good person because of one of those facets? Does the person understand what is meant by being a good person or is an entirely different meaning attached to the concept in that particular language group, that is different from what researchers might perceive as being a good person.
When words did not make sense in a certain context, the whole idea of analysing the personality-descriptive term became more challenging. After the categorisation of the personality-descriptive terms in facets, the data were sorted alphabetically. The worksheet consisting of the categorised descriptive terms, preparation of personality-descriptive terms, translated English responses, and the original responses were all sorted together in order to keep track of the various stages. After the data was sorted, the frequencies of the descriptive terms that made up a certain facet were summated.

5.8 Trustworthiness of findings

The process of cleaning, categorisation and clustering was conducted mainly by an independent researcher situated at North West University, and was closely monitored and discussed in several meetings with the SAPI project team members and other collaborators in the project. In between the categorisation and clustering phase, a two-day workshop was conducted with language and cultural experts from each of the 11 language groups. They had expert knowledge about the culture, beliefs, historical background, typical behavioural styles, and personality traits of the languages they represented.

5.9 Conclusion

This chapter addressed the research methodology employed in the study. The study was a qualitative, exploratory, descriptive study, using a non-probability purposive sampling. A biographical questionnaire and a 10-item interview provided the data, which was analysed according to the aims of the study. The results from this data analysis will be outlined and discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Chapter Preview

The results obtained from the data analysis are presented in this chapter. Prior to discussing the results of this study, it is important to revisit the aims, which were outlined in Chapter 4. The first aim was to explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speaking South Africans. The second aim was to explore and describe any possible relationship between personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speakers and current models or theories of personality.

6.2 Number of Personality Descriptive words

Content analysis was used to analyse, reduce and interpret the data obtained from the participants. As outlined in Chapter 5, this is a structured technique commonly applied to qualitative data in which the researcher constructs a set of categories, analyses individual data against these categories and classifies the data accordingly (Tyson, 1995). According to Lin and Church (2004) a content analysis approach helps to discover those personality dimensions that are specific to a particular culture.

The personality descriptors gathered from the interviews were captured in Xhosa in an Excel Worksheet until a saturation point had been reached (i.e., no new responses were obtained). The researcher read through all the responses in order to gain an overall picture of the data. Next, the personality descriptors were translated into English, and the translations were captured in the same Excel sheet next to the Xhosa descriptors. The next step included reducing the responses by removing all verbs and making the verbs singular. Thereafter, all superfluous words in the descriptions, for example: “is”, “are”, “not”, “he”, “she” etc. were removed. So, “it is always helpful” was reduced to “helpful”. Responses that were not a description of personality, such as physical appearance and terms that were evaluative, were removed. Finally, composite responses were split up (e.g., “she is helpful and caring” were coded “helpful” and “caring”). This process resulted in a list of personality descriptive words that were captured in the Excel Worksheet.
The total number of different words provided by the Xhosa-speaking sample to describe personality was 1872. Nel (2008) reports that, on average, the number of personality descriptions (responses) per language group for the larger SAPI study was 1588. Nel (2008) reports further that English-speaking respondents used the most descriptive words (2820) followed by Zulu (2056) and Xhosa-speaking (1872) respondents respectively. Respondents from the Sesotho sample used the smallest number of descriptive words (611). Consequently, the Xhosa-speaking sample being reported on in the present study provided a relatively high number of descriptive words when compared to the other language groups in the overall SAPI sample.

In addition, the average number of words per respondent in the Xhosa-speaking sample was 3.29. In the larger SAPI project, Nel (2008) reports that respondents for the Sepedi group provided the most words per respondent (12.56 words) while those from the Sesotho group provided the lowest number (2.42) per respondent. The average number of words per respondent for the Xhosa-speaking was low compared to the other language groups in the SAPI sample and was below the average across all the groups (5.98) as reported by Nel (2008).

6.3 Categorisation into personality-descriptive terms (facets)

As mentioned in chapter 5, content analysis was utilized in order to categorise the descriptive words into personality-descriptive terms (facets). Whereas the process of arriving at the descriptive words was fairly mechanical, the process of arriving at the personality-descriptive terms (facets) was more interpretive. Dictionaries, thesaurus and literature were used during the categorisation stage. Furthermore, the adequacy of categorising personality descriptors into personality-descriptive terms (facets) was checked by comparing the verbalisations provided by the participants in order to ensure that the process of categorising did not bring about changes in meaning. Personality-descriptive terms were intensely discussed in frequent group meetings between the collaborators of the SAPI project (some meetings were held in South Africa and in the Netherlands, and others were conducted by telephone meetings over the internet). This stage was regarded as the most important and sensitive in this qualitative study. The initial categorisation process initially yielded 503 personality-descriptive terms for the Xhosa-speaking sample. In the larger study, only the
English-speaking sample had more personality-descriptive terms when the initial categorisation was done (n=551) (Nel, 2008).

In many cases, persons were described by characteristic behaviours. These descriptions were then categorised under the English term deemed most appropriate. For example, “He was angered easily” was classified as *short-tempered*, “She was always on time for meetings” was classified as *punctual*, and “She was always there for you when you need her” was classified as *supportive*. Examples of personality-descriptive terms that were difficult to categorise were found throughout the 11 language groups (Nel, 2008). Although they were not many, they were important to keep in order not to lose data unnecessarily. For example, when a person is described as a “good person” (which is a broad term), it is sometimes difficult to understand what the respondent means. Is the person kind, loving, and caring or is the person morally conscious and honest? Might it be a combination of those facets, or is the reason for the person to be a good person because of one of those facets? Does the person understand what is meant by being a good person or is an entirely different meaning attached to the concept in that particular language group, i.e. different from what we as researchers perceive as being a good person. In the end, the term “good person” was disregarded for further analysis, since the meaning was ambiguous within and between the 11 language groups. This was confirmed with the quality insurance conducted with language and cultural experts.

After the initial categorisation, the research team subjected the initial personality-descriptive terms that had emerged to further review to see if they could be categorised into a smaller set of facets. In the process, the 503 initial personality-descriptive categories for the Xhosa-speaking sample were firstly reduced to 361 facets (see Appendix D) and secondly to 164. The final list of 164 personality-descriptive terms (facets) derived for the Xhosa-speaking sample is provided in Table 2.
### Table 2
List of Personality-Descriptive Terms (Facets) derived for the Xhosa-speaking sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent-minded ***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pretending *</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive *</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fashion conscious *</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Perseverant **</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically-oriented *</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fearful *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Playful **</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating ***</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Flexible **</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pleasant **</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising *</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Forgiving**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pleasure-seeking **</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive *</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Friendly *</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Progressive **</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeasing **</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Future-oriented *</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Protective **</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciative **</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Generous *</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Proud *</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Good relations with another **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Punctual *</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative **</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gossipping *</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Purposeful ***</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant *</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Grateful *</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rebellious **</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate *</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Greedy**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reckless **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic ***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hard-working *</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Religiosity *</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations for others **</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Heedful *</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Reserved **</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive *</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Helpful *</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Respectful *</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-seeking **</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Honest *</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Responsible *</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative *</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Humane ***</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Role-model *</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing life ***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Humble *</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Satisfying others ****</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivating *</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Humorous *</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Secretive **</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring *</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Impulsive**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-centered **</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful *</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Independent *</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Self-confident **</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative *</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Individualism ***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Selfish *</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Influential ***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-respectful *</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate *</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Inquisitive *</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sensitive *</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Facet</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Facet</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent **</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Interfering *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Serious **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive **</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Intelligent **</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Short-tempered *</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete work **</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Intimidating *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shy *</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate **</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Irritating **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sociable *</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive ***</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jealous *</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Socially Intelligent ***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content ***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kind *</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Solving problems of others *</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping ***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledgeable *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Story-teller *</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative **</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Likeable **</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Straightforward *</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous **</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Like to travel **</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strict *</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative **</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Logical **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stubborn *</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical **</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Loving *</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Supportive *</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel *</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Loyal ***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Talented **</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Materialistic *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Talkative *</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding **</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mature *</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Temperamental *</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent *</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Meticulous **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tense ***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denigrating **</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Morally conscious **</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Tidiness **</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined *</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Musical ***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thorough ***</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic **</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Needy **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tolerant **</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining *</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Noisy **</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Traditional *</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Obedient *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Troublesome *</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminative *</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Open for others **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trusting **</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreamer ***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Open-minded **</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trustworthy *</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to Learn *</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Optimistic **</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Truthful *</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional **</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Organized *</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Undermining ***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional sharing *</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Outspoken **</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Understanding **</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging *</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Passionate **</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Useless ***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising *</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Patient *</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Verbally aggressive *</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even-tempered *</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Peaceful *</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Visionary ***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerate ***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peace-keeping **</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vivacious **</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Nel (2008) there were at least 79 common personality-descriptive terms (facets) shared by the majority of the language groups in the larger study and 69 were semi-common, 63 of which were shared by the Xhosa sample. Furthermore, of the 32 semi-specific facets found in the larger study, 21 were identified in the Xhosa sample as well. Twelve language-specific personality-descriptors were found in the larger study, of which 1 (Satisfying others) could be found be found in the Xhosa sample. In Table 2, the common facets are denoted with a *, the semi-common with **, the semi-specific with ***, and the one language-specific one with ****. However, it should be noted that the facets that are semi-common, semi-specific or language-specific are not necessarily missing in other language groups.

There could be many reasons why a facet was not identified in a specific language group. In the case of the respondent, it could have been due to difficulty in finding the correct word to describe a person, which resulted in certain words not being used to describe another person. In the case of the researcher, it could have been the misjudgement of the underlying meaning of responses, or the incorrect translation. It is evident that more facets are common across all the South African language groups than the number that is specific only to some. This was true for the Xhosa-speaking sample where 163 of the 164 facets shared some communality with the facets derived for the other languages groups in the larger study. This finding is in keeping with most lexical studies where large numbers of shared facets are often found across language and cultural groups (Peabody & De Raad, 2002).
6.4 Towards a personality structure: Clustering of facets

Semantic cluster analysis was used to derive a broad cluster of facets to represent an initial personality structure for the Xhosa-speaking sample. Literature regarding personality structures (e.g., the Big Five Model and the Big Seven Model) as well as the structure of non-westernised personality measures (e.g., the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory) were studied in conjunction with other relevant personality literature to conceptualize an appropriate personality structure from the 164 facets for the Xhosa-sample (Nel, 2008). The facets were firstly clustered into sub-clusters based on shared content or behavioural styles (e.g., “caring”, “compassionate” and “humane” were clustered under “Empathy”). In total 37 sub-clusters were derived. Secondly, the sub-clusters were reviewed and clustered further into common dimensions. Nine main clusters (personality dimensions) were derived as a result.

While the research team initially focused on conducting the clustering for the individual language groups, given the large number of common and semi-common facets found, attention shifted to deriving an overall structure across language groups and to then report on how the facets derived per language group “fit” the overall structure. Thus, what is reported in Table 3 is the 9 clusters and 37 facets found across all language groups, with the specific facets derived in the Xhosa-speaking sample listed under each of the clusters and sub-clusters.
Table 3
Emerging Personality Structure for the Xhosa-speaking sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Soft-heartedness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Emotional stability</th>
<th>Intellect</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Relationship harmony</th>
<th>Facilitating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Amiability</td>
<td>Achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Broad-mindedness</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Attention-seeking</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Dreamer</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Irritating</td>
<td>Hard-working</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Concrete work</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>Needy</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Morally</td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>Self-respectful</td>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Conscious</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Role-model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Emotional sensitivity</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Pretending</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Open to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivating</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Emotional sensitivity</td>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>Encouraging others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional sharing</td>
<td>Future-oriented</td>
<td>Emotional sensitivity</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Skillfulness</td>
<td>Discriminative</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Emotional sensitivity</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Artfulness</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open to others</td>
<td>Aspirations for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>Academically-oriented</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td>Self-centred</td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>Meticulous</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Eager to learn</td>
<td>Interpersonal relatedness</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>Selfish</td>
<td>Emotion control</td>
<td>Organised</td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Inquisitive</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td>Troublesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Gratefulness</td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>Appreciative</td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>Perceptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Grateful</td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>Tidiness</td>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Socially conscious</td>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure-seeking</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivacious</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Good relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert/</td>
<td>Denigrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace-keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Exploiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well-mannered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Intimidating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story-teller</td>
<td>aggressively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empathy**
- Caring
- Compassionate
- Considerate
- Humane
- Loving
- Respectful
- Satisfying others

**Active Support**
- Community involvement

**Self-disciplined**
- Obedient
- Rebellious

**Thoughtless**
- Absent-minded
- Reckless

**Courage**
- Courageous
- Fearful

**Balance**
- Balancing life
- Even-tempered
- Mature
- Short-tempered

**Openness to experience**
- Adventurous
- Like to travel

**Co-operative**
- Forgiving
- Good relations with others
- Peaceful
- Peace-keeping
- Well-mannered

**Meddlesome**
- Gossiping
- Interfering
Heedful
Helpful
Protective
Solving problems of others
Supportive
A brief overall description of the 9 clusters and their sub-clusters is presented below.

**Extraversion** consists of Dominance, Expressiveness, Positive Emotionality, and Sociability. Extraversion is described as the act, state, or habit of being predominantly concerned with, and obtaining gratification from, what is outside the self; being socially assertive, forceful and influential; to openly share or communicate with others; being energetic, cheerful, upbeat and optimistic; and having the tendency or disposition to be sociable, outgoing, and gregarious.

**Soft-Heartedness** consists of Amiability, Egoism, Gratefulness, Hostility, Empathy, and Active Support. Soft-Heartedness is defined as a feeling of concern for the welfare of someone else (especially someone who is defenceless); putting the welfare of others before that of personal interests and welfare; being friendly, kind and helpful and providing support to others; a dislike of aggressive and anti-social behaviour; a compassionate type of person who is understanding, respectful and sensitive towards others’ feelings and needs, and a deep commitment to serving one’s community (in sub-Saharan Africa this is often encapsulated as *humanity towards others*).

**Conscientiousness** consists of Achievement-oriented, Dedication, Orderliness, Self-disciplined, and Thoughtless. Conscientiousness is described as being painstaking and careful, to accomplish something through great effort or inner drive; it is the opposite of being reckless and uncaring with respect to own or others’ safety; it includes being devoted to reach certain goals, being reliable and hard-working, and being disciplined and organised.

**Emotional Stability** consists of Ego Strength, Emotional Sensitivity, Emotional Control, Neuroticism, Balance, and Courage. Emotional Stability, in this context, means that a person is emotionally either well or unwell; possesses inner confidence and strength; is sensitive to external events/factors and to others; being able to control and manage own emotions or actions; and being emotionally sound, mature and capable of handling life’s issues.

**Intellect** consists of Aesthetics, Reasoning, Skilfulness, and Social Intellect. Intellect is described as the capacity for thinking and acquiring knowledge; having a special natural ability or aptitude; being knowledgeable and observant of outward and inward things; being
competent; having a degree of efficiency in certain aspects; and having insight into the emotions and internal well-being of others.

*Openness* consists of *Broad-Mindedness, Epistemic Curiosity, Materialism and Openness to Experience*. Openness is defined as being receptive to new and different ideas or things or to the opinions of others; and a person who is inquisitive and wants to learn new things.

*Integrity* consists of *Integrity and Fairness*. It is described as the moral consciousness of a human being, characterised by being honest, loyal, responsible, dependable and trustworthy.

*Relationship Harmony* consists of *Approachability, Conflict-seeking, Interpersonal Relatedness,* and *Meddlesome*. Relationship Harmony, in this context, means a state in which a person strives to maintain good relationships with others; to keep the peace; to be affable and friendly; and to be tolerant, understanding and flexible.

*Facilitating* consists of *Guidance and Encouraging Others*. Facilitating could be described as guiding and assisting others through being a role-model and giving advice; and boosting and encouraging others through one’s own behaviour and words of encouragement and advice.

The findings presented in sections 6.1 and 6.2 address the first aim of this study, that is, to explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for a sample of Xhosa-speaking South Africans. The second aim of the study was to compare the findings for the Xhosa-speaking sample to the personality factors contained in existing models and theories of personality, personality research findings and personality tests. This will be addressed in the remaining sections of this chapter.

### 6.5 Universal personality facets versus indigenous personality facets

For personality researchers, most of the facets identified in the present study will be recognised as being well-known terms that can be found in existing personality models and the research literature. The recognisability of the facets comes from two sources. Firstly, international literature and dictionaries were studied in order to assign the most applicable labels for the personality-descriptive terms in the initial analyses. In the end, the resources utilised could have influenced the outcome. Secondly, some of the facets identified were
assigned in accordance with direct labels derived in the semi-structured interview, thus, some labels of the overall nine clusters (or 37 sub-clusters) can be identified at the level of the responses, which suggests that they are popular terms. Examples are Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Emotional stability, and Integrity. Responses that corresponded with these broad terms were classified as such, which also lead to the widely familiar attributes being derived.

Rieman, Angleitner, and Strelau (1997) state that universal or shared facets between cultural groups and regions are usually more numerous than are dissimilarities. For instance, McCrae, Costa, Ostendorf, Angleitner, Hrebickova et al. (2000) state that universal facets exist because most of the personality facets that a person possesses are developed through biological compositions of people (Maccoby, 2000). Even though many cross-cultural personality researchers (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2004; Saucier, 2003; Triandis & Suh, 2002) argue that personality is the result of both biological and cultural influences, factors like Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional stability, Intellect or Openness to Experience (all well-known FFM factors) are still well replicated in most regions across the world (Lee & Ashton, 2005), although the overall composition of each of these factors may differ. This is the case in both the larger SAPI study (Nel, 2008) and in the present study.

While many clusters identified corresponded well with other personality models identified in literature, additional clusters were incorporated which demonstrate the uniqueness of the South African personality structure (Nel, 2008). This uniqueness could be a consequence of the cultural composition of the different South African language groups. For instance, the Facilitating cluster was developed as it represented something different from the Dominance sub-cluster of Extraversion. Dominance is understood, in this sense, to be socially assertive and forceful, which might elicit compliance in others, while Facilitating refers more to the consenting influence of a person towards others; this person is usually well respected and seen as an exemplary person in the community.

6.6 Ubuntu: Indigenous concepts

The concept of Ubuntu is popular in South Africa today, and it was not surprising to find facets that corresponded with the overall concept of Ubuntu. Nyembezi (1977) describes
Ubuntu as ‘to live and care for others, to act kindly towards others, to be hospitable, to be just and fair, to be compassionate, to assist those in distress, to be dependable and honest, to have good morals’. Ubuntu is associated with respect for others and their belongings; to have tolerance, compassion and sensitivity towards the elders, the handicapped and the less privileged; to be obedient towards adults, parents, seniors, and authority; to be courteous and show loyalty towards others; to be welcoming, warm, generous, trustworthy and honest. All these aspects assist in building and maintaining relationships (Battle, 1997). In the Xhosa personality structure, the clusters of Soft-heartedness, Integrity and Relationship harmony correspond the strongest with the description and meaning of Ubuntu (Mfutso-Bengo, 2001; Nolte-Schamm, 2006; Nyembezi, 1977).

The cluster Soft-heartedness and its sub-clusters of Empathy and Active Support comprise many personality facets that are related to the spirit of Ubuntu: caring and loving (showing and having care and love/affection for others), compassionate (having empathy or sympathy for others), considerate (respect others’ feelings and believes), satisfying others (making sure others are happy and content before attending to own problems), community involvement (either actively involved in the community by giving support and assistance where needed, in educating youngsters, building houses for community members, or being a leader, or being passively involved by caring for the community), generous (by giving food, shelter or money to others who are less privileged), helpful and supportive (giving support by helping with building and maintaining the community, or supportive in the sense of being there as a friend through a crisis), to solve problems of others (helping others through advice or actively solving a problem or crisis), and heedful (to lend an ear to others as a way of giving support and assistance). All of these facets contain some of the meaning given to the overall description and understanding of the concept of Ubuntu.

Integrity also seems to encompass some elements of the spirit of Ubuntu. For instance, the facets of honest and truthful (by being truthful about intentions and feelings, and not pretending), morally conscious (by having morals and values, and acting accordingly), and trustworthy (by being reliable, and dependable), are closely related to Nyembezi (1977) description of Ubuntu. The cluster of Relationship harmony also consists of some of the terms recognisable as Ubuntu-related: having good relations with others, maintaining constructive relations, and being peaceful, and if differences arise being the peacekeeper in order to build and sustain good relationships with others.
The collectivistic environment in South Africa today is reinforced in the overall understanding of the *Ubuntu* spirit. In the personality structure derived for the Xhosa-speaking sample, a strong indication of the spirit of *Ubuntu* is evident. However, it should be noted that in the larger study, in all of the 11 official language groups found in South Africa, the personality facets that correspond with the concept of *Ubuntu* emerged clearly. It can thus not be concluded that the spirit of *Ubuntu* is more clearly present in one language group than in another (Nel, 2008).

### 6.7 Correspondence with personality models

There seems to be a moderate to high correspondence of the personality structure for the Xhosa-speaking sample and the major personality models found in literature, especially with the first six clusters of *Extraversion, Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Intellect,* and *Openness*. However, in looking closely at the general make-up of each of the clusters, there are some differences in the composition of the personality dimensions when compared with those of existing personality models. As the Five-Factor Model (FFM) is the most widely referred to model in personality research and test development, the clusters (personality dimensions) and sub-clusters (facets) identified in the present study will be compared to those of the FFM. In the process aspects of the clusters and sub-clusters identified in the present study will be illuminated further. Furthermore, reasons why certain facets were grouped under one cluster and not another will be critically explored in relation to past research and personality models.

#### 6.7.1 Correspondence with the Five-Factor Model (FFM)

When examining the first six clusters of our structure, several of the clusters and sub-clusters (facets) can be linked to aspects contained in the FFM. Each of the dimensions of the FFM will be considered below in relation to the clusters and sub-clusters identified in the present study.

*Extraversion.* Extraversion is featured as a personality dimension in both the FFM and in one of the clusters identified in the present study. When unpacking the composition of the *Extraversion* dimensions in the FFM and the present study, a few observations can be made with respect to the facets. Dominance as sub-cluster of *Extraversion* in the present study is
reflected in the Extraversion dimension in the FFM (Bozionelis, 2003; John & Srivastava, 1999; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006) and is very similar in composition. Being assertive, authoritative and strict are common aspects, while disciplining seems to be a more indigenous concept. Disciplining, in this context, refers to a parent disciplining a child, or a teacher disciplining a student, implying that relationships are governed by authority hierarchies. It also corresponds with the facet strict, which in some sense explains the person’s ability to apply rules and stand his or her ground when his or her authority is questioned.

When looking at the other Extraversion sub-clusters identified in the present study in relation to those of the FFM, associations could be observed, especially for the last two sub-clusters of Positive Emotionality and Sociability. The sub-cluster of Expressiveness seems to correspond in some way to the Extraversion factor in the FFM, although there are some differences. For example, Goldberg (1990) included the trait forward in the Extraversion factor of the FFM. Being straightforward, which was classified under Expressiveness in the present study, is understood as being a way of communicating with others in a forward or direct manner. For example, Goldberg (1990) included the trait forward in the Extraversion factor of the FFM. Being straightforward, which was classified under Expressiveness in the present study, is understood as being a way of communicating with others in a forward or direct manner. However, there are also dissimilarities. For example, a facet like emotional sharing, is categorised under the Agreeableness factor in the FFM, whereas in our indigenous context, it fitted better under the Expressiveness facet. Overall though, there seems to be a moderately good correspondence between the Extraversion cluster identified in the present study and the Extraversion cluster of FFM.

Agreeableness. The Soft-heartedness cluster and its facets appear to relate moderately well to the Agreeableness factor of the FFM. However the composition of the FFM’s Agreeableness factor and the present study’s Soft-heartedness cluster differ in some ways. Overall, Agreeableness is characterised as being friendly compliant versus hostility compliant (Digman & Inouye, 1986), while Soft-heartedness in the present study represents a mix between actively or inactively demonstrating kindness or support towards others. On the one hand, the inclusion of the sub-clusters (facets), Hostility and Amiability as part of Soft-heartedness, in the present study correspond well with Digman and Inouye’s (1986) definition of Agreeableness. Furthermore, the sub-clusters of Amiability and Empathy
identified in the present study’s *Soft-heartedness* cluster include many aspects that are observed in FFM lexical studies (e.g., Larsen & Buss, 2005). The only deviance seems to be inclusion of the indigenous attribute of *satisfying others* in the *Empathy* facet. On the other hand, while there is a strong emphasis in the *Soft-heartedness* cluster on caring for and supporting others and on community involvement in the *Empathy* and *Active Support* facets, which is in keeping with Xhosa culture, these aspects are emphasised less in the *Agreeableness* factor. When examining other descriptions of *Agreeableness*, the *Soft-heartedness* cluster in the present study seems to be closer to the definition of Goldberg (1990), which includes many of the facets found in this study (e.g., sympathetic, kind, warm, understanding, harsh and cruel).

When discussing the *Agreeableness* factor of the FFM in relation to the clusters identified in the present study, one should also consider the *Relationship harmony* cluster. As is the case with *Soft-heartedness*, *Relationship harmony* comprises many facets commonly associated with *Agreeableness* dimensions. While *quarrelsome* is seen in most cases as a dimension of *Agreeableness* in the FFM literature (Goldberg & Somer, 2000; Lorr & Knight, 1987; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996), *argumentative* (a synonym for *quarrelsome*) was included in the *Relationship harmony* sub-cluster of *Conflict-seeking* in the present study. The *Relationship harmony* cluster also encompasses the facets of *Approachability, Interpersonal Relatedness*, and *Meddlesome*, which consists of *gossiping* and *interfering*, and some aspects of the *Approachability* sub-cluster (being *arrogant* and *stubborn*). Graziano and Tobin (2002) argue that people who score high on *Agreeableness* would try to resolve conflicts, and prefer to avoid conflict situations, which relates to the *Approachability, Conflict-seeking, Interpersonal Relatedness* and *Meddlesome* sub-clusters identified in the present study. In the present study, *Agreeableness* was differentiated into the two clusters of *Soft-heartedness* and *Relationship harmony* to provide a richer description of the personality structure of the Xhosa-speaking sample. Whereas a person scoring high on *Soft-heartedness* might be described as *kind, generous, helpful* and *supportive*, people scoring high on *Relationship harmony* tend to keep relationships as peaceful as possible through being *accommodating, tolerant, appeasing* and keeping the peace (*peacekeeping*).

**Conscientiousness.** The correspondence of the *Conscientiousness* cluster identified in the present study and the *Conscientiousness* factor of the FFM appears to be moderate. Hard work, punctuality, and reliable behaviour are considered to be characteristics of the
Conscientiousness factor in the FFM (Langford, 2003). In the present study, hard-working, being punctual and being consistent (or reliable) were classified as being part of the Conscientiousness cluster. Being dutiful, responsible, and thorough are further seen to be characteristics of Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In the Conscientiousness cluster in the present study, being dutiful and thorough were identified among the facets. According to Goldberg (1990), being organised, neat, and meticulous are the desirable traits when scoring high on Conscientiousness, while less desirable traits are associated with being careless and sloppy. The latter were also well represented in the Conscientiousness cluster in the present study, especially in the sub-clusters of Orderliness and Thoughtlessness.

Although there is a strong correspondence, some deviations can also be identified. For instance, the inclusion of competitive in the Conscientiousness cluster (more specifically in the sub-cluster Achievement-oriented) in the present study might be debatable, as it is traditionally considered to an aspect of Extraversion (Goldberg, 1990; De Raad & Peabody, 2005). The reason for including competitive under Conscientiousness rather than Extraversion in the present study was due to the fact that when respondents referred to people being competitive it was usually linked to an achievement-oriented context. Consequently, it was perceived to fit well with the hard-working aspect of the Achievement-oriented sub-cluster of Conscientiousness for Xhosa-speakers.

Neuroticism. The correspondence of the Emotional stability cluster identified in the present study and the Neuroticism factor of the FFM appears to be moderate. The description of the Neuroticism factor provided by Goldberg (1990) implies that a person is either calm, relaxed, and emotionally stable or moody, anxious, and insecure, which corresponds well with the description of the Emotional stability cluster in the present study. However, as with the Conscientiousness cluster, there are some differences between the composition of the Neuroticism and Emotional Stability factors. For example, in the present study the Neuroticism facet in the Emotional Stability cluster only includes two aspects related to Neuroticism, namely, Content and Tense. The sub-facets of depressive and neurotic were not identified in the Xhosa-speaking sample.

Furthermore, the sub-cluster of Courage in the present study consists of the sub-facet courageous, which is traditionally included in the Extraversion factor of the FFM. The Courage facet was included in the Emotional stability cluster based on the fact that
courageous and fearful were grouped together to form the Courage sub-cluster. Fearful, in this context, means that a person might be anxious in certain situations, and show fear when confronted with something he or she wants to avoid. The latter description relates well with the meaning of courageous, which is the opposite of showing fear. As there is an emotional aspect to these two facets, it made sense to group them under Emotional stability and not under Extraversion.

Intellect. The fifth and sixth clusters, Intellect and Openness, show agreement with a factor of the FFM that is variously labelled as Intellect (Goldberg, 1992), Openness to Experience (Costa & McCrae, 1992), Creativity and Imagination (Saucier, 1992) and, more recently, as Autonomy (Rodriguez-Fornells, Lorenzo-Seva, & Andres-Pueyo, 2001). Goldberg’s (1990) definition of Intellect includes concepts such as creative, imaginative, and intelligent, which were found in the Intellect cluster in the present study as well. However, what makes the cluster identified in the present study different is the inclusion of both skills or abilities and social intellectual concepts. Being perceptive, socially intelligent and understanding were clustered in the sub-cluster of Social Intellect. Perceptive has already been found to be a dimension of Intellect or Openness (John & Srivastava, 1999), while understanding has been found to be associated with Agreeableness (Goldberg, 1990). The inclusion of the understanding sub-facet under Intellect was done in accordance with the analysis of the composition of responses that made up this facet. Most responses referred to people who are objective about others, and grasp situations and others completely, pointing to a person’s social abilities. This prompted the inclusion of the sub-facet understanding in conjunction with perceptive and socially intelligent under Social intellect.

Openness to Experience. Openness as identified in the present study showed a reasonable correspondence with Costa and McCrae’s (1992) Openness to Experience factor, although the inclusion of some indigenous concepts made the correspondence less than perfect. Sub-facets like traditional were included, which made the overall meaning of Openness in the present study different to how this concept is described in literature. For example, sub-facets like dreamer, prim and proper, progressive, visionary, fashion conscious, and like to travel give a new definition to the overall concept of Openness in the present study. Visionary, for example, demonstrates a person’s ability to see into the future, or to dream about things that are going to happen. According to Watson (2003), a person scoring high on Openness might be open-minded enough to have prophetic dreams. Furthermore, Buss (1993) argues that an
open person likes to experiment with new things, and likes novel experiences, which explains why adventurous and like to travel were also included in this cluster. In addition, Openness consists of many expressive aspects (Peabody & Goldberg, 1989), which were reflected in the present study as eager to learn, inquisitive, and open-minded.

In the present study, religiosity was grouped as a sub-facet of Broad-Mindedness in the Openness cluster. Religiosity has been found to load onto both Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Katigbak, Church, Guanzon-Lapena, Carlota, & del Pilar, 2002) in a study in the Philippines. However, there is still much debate whether religiosity is a personality dimension or personal outlook (Church & Katigbak, 2005).

Two clusters identified in the present study, Integrity and Facilitating, are not traditionally considered to be separate factors in the FFM. However, when the FFM was researched in Hungary, the fifth factor of Intellect or Openness did not replicate well, while Integrity came out as the fifth factor (Szirmak & De Raad, 1994). No evidence for a Facilitating cluster could be found in research regarding the FFM. However, some of the Integrity and Facilitating facets correspond well to aspects of the FFM. For instance, responsible and trustworthy from the Integrity cluster in the present study could relate to the Conscientiousness factor (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1990), and leadership of the Facilitating cluster could be represented as part of the Extraversion factor of the FFM (John & Srivastava, 1999). On the other hand, the overall correspondence of the composition of the Integrity and Facilitating clusters to the overall make-up of the FFM is generally weak.

6.7.2 Correspondence with the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2)

The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2) was developed by gathering data on popular descriptions of personality from which a personality structure was derived and the items and scales of the CPAI-2 were developed. A fairly similar approach has been adopted in the SAPI project to ultimately develop the South African Personality Inventory. In view of this, and given that for both the Chinese and South African inventories the aim is not to develop them based on an existing personality model/theory, it is interesting to compare the emerging personality structure for the Xhosa-speaking sample to that of the CPAI-2.
Generally, there is very little agreement between the emerging personality structure for the Xhosa-speaking and South African samples (Nel, 2008) and the CPAI. The CPAI-2 (Cheung et al. 2003) consists of four main factors, namely, Dependability, Interpersonal Relatedness, Social Potency, and Accommodation, and its clinical factors have been divided into two dimensions, Emotional Problems and Behavioural Problems. These factors will now be briefly considered in relation to the clusters and facets identified in the present study.

**Dependability.** Dependability encompasses a variety of facets found in the Xhosa and South African personality structures although these facets were grouped into clusters other than Dependability. Cheung and Cheung (2003) state that Dependability consists of aspects such as responsibility, emotionality, inferiority versus self-acceptance, practical-mindedness, optimism versus pessimism, meticulousness, internal versus external locus of control, and family orientation. The aspect of responsibility corresponds with the cluster of Integrity in the present study which mostly consists of facets and sub-facets like being trustworthy, honest, responsible, truthful and morally conscious. The emotionality and meticulousness aspects of the Dependability factor of the CPAI-2 correspond to aspects identified as being part of the Emotional stability and Conscientiousness clusters in the present study. The inferiority versus self-acceptance of the CPAI-2 seems to relate to the Ego strength sub-cluster of the Emotional stability cluster identified in the present study.

Furthermore, the Emotional control sub-cluster of the Emotional stability cluster identified in the present study includes the sub-facets of coping and impulsive, which corresponds with the internal versus external locus of control facet of the Dependability factor. Optimism versus pessimism corresponds somewhat with the Positive emotionality sub-cluster of Extraversion in the present study which includes optimistic as a sub-facet. While Family orientation was not identified as a facet or sub-facet in the present study, it could bear some resemblance to community involvement, which was categorised under Active Support in the Soft-heartedness cluster. Overall, it seems that while the present study did not identify a separate Dependability cluster/factor, many of the facets of Dependability were incorporated in various of the clusters identified in the present study. Generally, the largest overlap was found between Dependability and the Conscientiousness, Emotional stability and Integrity clusters in the present study. These findings are in line with a recent study done by Cheung (2006) using factor analysis to compare the scales of the CPAI-2 and the NEO-FFI (measuring the FFM, Costa & McCrae, 1992), where most of the scales of Dependability
loaded on the *Neuroticism* factor, while the scales of *Responsibility* and *Meticulous* loaded on *Conscientiousness*.

**Interpersonal Relatedness.** Interpersonal Relatedness consists of the facets of traditionalism versus modernity, reng qing (relationship orientation), social sensitivity, discipline, harmony, and thrift versus extravagance (Cheung & Cheung, 2003; Cheung, 2006). The relation of the facets of this scale to the *Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Openness, and Relationship harmony* clusters identified in the present study is self-evident. Traditionalism versus modernity seems to describe similar characteristics as the *traditional* and *fashion conscious* sub-facets in the *Openness* cluster. It should be noted that traditionalism as defined in the CPAI-2 pertains to the Chinese culture (Cheung et al., 1996), and more specifically the attitudes towards Chinese culture and traditions (Jia-Ling Lin, & Church, 2004), whereas *traditional* in the Xhosa-speaking and South African structures pertains to collective traditions and their enactment across the 11 language groups.

There is some relationship between *relationship orientation* and *harmony* of the CPAI-2 with aspects of the *Relationship harmony* cluster. The relationship seems to be strongest with the *Approachability* and *Interpersonal relatedness* sub-clusters of *Relationship harmony*. *Approachability* is described as being approachable and accessible to others on an interpersonal level versus placing oneself above others. *Interpersonal relatedness* is described as the ability of a person to be constructive in relationships, to actively maintain them by being forgiving, peaceful, and cooperative.

When it comes to *social sensitivity* on the CPAI-2, the *Approachability* facet of the *Relationship harmony* cluster comprises many sub-facets that indicate socially responsive and sensitive behaviour (i.e., being **approachable, humble, open for others, tolerant**, etc.). The *Social intellect* facet of the *Intellect* cluster could also correspond in some way to *social sensitivity*, more specifically being **perceptive, socially intelligent**, and having **understanding** for others. *Discipline* in the CPAI-2 seems to be a component that relates to the *Conscientiousness* cluster in the present study (e.g., *dutiful* of the *Achievement-oriented* sub-cluster, aspects of the *Orderliness* sub-cluster such as being **disciplined, organised, punctual**, and to being **obedient which is found in** the sub-cluster of *Self-disciplined*).
Thrifty versus extravagance in the CAPI-2 seems to correspond with the *Egoism* sub-cluster of *Soft-heartedness* in the present study. *Egoism* includes the sub-facets of *generous* (which is the opposite of thrifty), *self-centred*, and *selfish*. In the present dataset, *generous* also encompassed thrifty behaviour, being stingy with money, and giving away things. Furthermore, the sub-cluster of *Materialism* under *Openness* could also share some characteristics with thrifty versus extravagance of the CPAI-2. In the study done by Cheung (2006), Interpersonal Relatedness seems to be different from the factors of the FFM’s questionnaire and the NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992), although social sensitivity loaded on the *Extraversion* scale, which is quite different from the original understanding of the social sensitivity scale of the CPAI-2, and the *Extraversion* cluster in the present study.

**Social Potency.** The third factor of the CPAI-2 of Social Potency also corresponds with different clusters and sub-clusters identified in the present study. *Social Potency* consists of novelty, diversity, divergent thinking, leadership, logical versus affective orientation, aesthetics, extraversion versus introversion, and enterprise (Cheung & Cheung, 2003). Both the facets of *novelty* and *divergent thinking* seem to fit well with the overall description of the *Openness* cluster identified in the present study. *Novelty* particularly links to facets like *inquisitive*, *investigative*, *adventurous*, and *like to travel*, and *divergent thinking* links to *open-minded* (as in thinking ‘out-of-the-box’). *Divergent thinking*, however, also includes some *Intellect*-type facets, more specifically being *creative*. Additional facets of *Social Potency* that correspond with *Intellect* are *aesthetics* and *enterprising* (which are sub-clusters of *Intellect* in the present study). *Logical versus affective orientation* corresponds less well with the *logical* facet of *Intellect* in the present study, since the emotional aspect is also included in the CPAI-2 description of this facet. There is, however, a strong correspondence with *extraversion vs. introversion* of the CPAI-2 and the *Extraversion* cluster in the present study. This re-affirms the findings of the study of Cheung (2006) where the *extraversion vs. introversion* scale loaded on the *Extraversion* factor of the NEO-FFI. Furthermore, Cheung (2006) also found that most of the *Social Potency* scales loaded on the *Openness* factor of the NEO-FFI. It is thus not surprising that many of the facets of *Social Potency* appear to relate to facets in the *Openness* cluster as well as the *Intellect* cluster.

**Accommodation.** According to Cheung and Cheung (2003), *Accommodation* consists of defensiveness, graciousness versus meanness, interpersonal tolerance, self versus social orientation, and veraciousness versus slickness. *Defensiveness* seems to have no
correspondence with any of the clusters identified in the present study. However, there is some correspondence for Graciousness versus meanness. Graciousness towards others is implied Well-mannered sub-facet of the Relationship harmony cluster as well as in the sub-facet of Respectful in of the Soft-heartedness cluster in the present study. Likewise, Meanness seems to correspond with aspects of the Hostility sub-cluster of the Soft-heartedness cluster. Interpersonal tolerance corresponds with the Relationship harmony cluster in the present study, which encompasses sub-facets that imply being tolerant, and open for others. In terms of the other clusters identified in the present study, interpersonal tolerance could also be linked with the sub-cluster Empathy in the Soft-heartedness cluster. Veraciousness versus slickness is probably associated with the Integrity cluster in the present study, which encompasses the moral soundness of a person. Being honest and truthful seem to be the main meaning of veraciousness, whereas slickness leans more towards being immoral in that a person could misrepresent information in order to get something in return. Such a person will be seen to be untrustworthy and pretending, which are sub-facets of Integrity. However, in the Cheung (2006) study, all of the Accommodation scales loaded on the Agreeableness factor of the NEO-FFI. Consequently, this suggests that the greater overlap between the clusters derived on the present study and Accommodation is more likely with the Soft-heartedness and Relationship harmony clusters and possibly less so with the Integrity cluster.

When considering the clinical factors included in the CPAI-2 one could also recognise some factors that relate in some ways to certain clusters derived in the present study. The clinical factors of the CPAI-2 are divided into emotional problems and behavioural problems (Cheung & Cheung, 2003). The emotional problems scales consist of anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, somatisation, and sexual maladjustment. The only link to the clusters derived in the present study is with the Emotional stability cluster, but it is a very weak link.

The behavioural problems scales consist of pathological dependence, hypomania, anti-social behaviour, need for attention, distortion of reality, and paranoia, which are related to some aspects of our structure. There is some overlap in this regard with the delinquent sub-facet of the Hostility sub-cluster of the Soft-heartedness cluster. Anti-social behaviours that were included in the overall make-up of the delinquent sub-facet were rape, murder, theft, and so on. Attention-seeking (a sub-facet of the Ego strength sub-cluster in the Emotional stability cluster corresponds with need for attention in the CPAI-2, while the obsessive/compulsive
sub-facet of the *Emotional control* sub-cluster of the *Emotional stability* cluster could be linked to *paranoia*. Overall, it can be concluded that the *emotional* and *behavioural problems* scales of the CPAI-2 can mainly be linked to the *Emotional stability* and *Soft-heartedness* clusters found in the present study.

Thus, while the CPAI-2 has different scales to the main personality dimensions identified in the present study, many of the facets and sub-facets identified in the present study can be found in the CPAI-2 even if they are grouped under different scales.

### 6.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, the results of the study were presented and discussed. The findings have been linked to personality models, previous studies and the literature reviewed in previous chapters. It became evident that the composition of the various clusters and sub-clusters identified in this study are similar in some ways to factors identified in other studies but also contain unique aspects. Nonetheless, the clusters and sub-clusters identified need to be cross-validated in quantitative studies before the preliminary personality structure for Xhosa-speakers postulated in this study can be propagated with confidence.

The conclusions based on the results of this study, limitations of this study, and recommendations for future research, will be considered in the final chapter.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Chapter Preview

This chapter provides a summary of the main findings and conclusions of the results presented in Chapter 6. The limitations of the research are discussed, followed by recommendations for future research.

7.2 Overview of the findings of the study

The main findings of the study will be presented in accordance with the aims of the study, which were 1) to explore and describe the personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speaking South Africans 2) to explore and describe any possible relationship between personality factors that emerge for Xhosa-speakers and current models of personality.

1872 personality responses were obtained from the semi-structured interviews. The initial categorisation process yielded 503 personality-descriptive terms for the Xhosa-speaking sample. Upon further clustering the 503 personality-descriptive categories were firstly reduced to 361 facets and thereafter to 164. In a study by Nel (2008) which combined all the personality-descriptors (facets) in the larger study from all the 11 official languages in South Africa, at least 79 personality-descriptors (facets) were found to be common among all the language groups and 69 were semi-common, 63 of which were identified in the Xhosa-speaking sample in this study. Of the 32 semi-specific facets, 21 were reflected in the Xhosa-speaking sample. In the overall sample, 12 language-specific personality-descriptors were found, of which one (satisfying others) was found in the Xhosa-speaking sample.

The 164 facets identified in the responses of the Xhosa-sample were firstly grouped into 37 sub-clusters from which nine overarching clusters were derived. The nine clusters found were Extraversion, Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Intellect, Openness, Integrity, Relationship harmony and Facilitating.
It is evident in the literature that Xhosa-speaking people have strong interpersonal relations; they place a high value on caring for and showing compassion towards each other (humaneness); and they are also sociable with one another. Relationships are therefore valued in the Xhosa culture, and this becomes part of the culture from a very young age through traditional rituals and ceremonies in which young ones are taught how to relate and behave. It is thus not surprising that aspects of caring, showing compassion, lending support, and being sociable came out strongly in the Soft-heartedness cluster in particular, but also in the Relationship Harmony and Extraversion clusters.

As mentioned in Chapter 6, most of the personality descriptors obtained in the study clearly indicate that the Xhosa speaking people value interpersonal relations (Soft-heartedness, Extraversion and Relationship harmony) deeply. It was not surprising to find facets that corresponded with the overall notion of Ubuntu which is an integral aspect of the South African society. Ubuntu is an important traditional value of the Xhosa culture and it is understood to encompass the notion that a person will regard himself or herself as part of a collective group, and not as an individual person. Among the facets that connect with the spirit of Ubuntu are caring, friendly, kind, loving, generous, and sociable which show a strong inclination of the Xhosa-speaking people to be sensitive towards others (see Table 2 in Chapter 6). Other facets such as helpful, compassionate, supportive highlight the contribution people make towards others in order to build and maintain relationships. Facets such as honest, considerate, trustworthy and tolerant are important for maintaining healthy and open relationships between people.

As discussed more fully in Chapter 6, there is a moderate correspondence between the clusters and sub-clusters identified in the Xhosa-speaking sample and the Five Factor personality model (FFM) and related personality research literature. The correspondence is especially noticeable for six clusters (Extraversion, Soft-heartedness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Intellect, and Openness), while it is less so for Integrity, Relationship harmony and Facilitating. However, when looking closely at the general composition of each of the clusters in comparison to the factors of the FFM, there were both similarities and differences. Some of the differences could be due to indigenous factors in the Xhosa-speaking sample (e.g., community involvement, humane, satisfying others) while others could be due to the grouping choices made when facets were categorised into clusters in the present study.
Furthermore, when the clusters and sub-clusters identified in the present study were compared with the scales of the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2), a low overall correspondence was noted. However, many of the facets and sub-facets identified in the present study corresponded with aspects of the scales of the CPAI-2.

7.3 Limitations

The present research is not without limitations. The main limitations will be outlined in this section.

The results of this study may not be representative of all Xhosa-speaking South Africans due to the convenience sampling method used that only included representatives from Port Elizabeth and Alexandria in the Eastern Cape Province. Furthermore, the interviews were conducted among only 95 respondents of the Xhosa culture, which is a relatively small sample size. Results from 95 Xhosa speaking people cannot be generalised to the rest of Xhosa population in South Africa.

Most African language groups have limited vocabulary, and accurate translation of Xhosa terms into English proved to be challenging for the language experts. Another limitation is the accuracy of the categorisation of personality-descriptive words into personality facets and clusters. Cultural experts were included in order to minimise categorisation mistakes; however, some interpretations could still have been incorrect.

Some of the English words do not really convey the exact meaning of a Xhosa word. For example, Xhosa speakers say ‘unamaqhinga’ (has tricks) which was later translated into the personality descriptor, *creative*. Yet this does not really depict the meaning that is conveyed by the word. In the Xhosa culture it really refers to somebody who is shrewd and manipulative. The other example is ‘akaseli’ (a teetotaller) which was initially translated into English as *temperamental*. However, after discussions with the independent researcher who consulted accredited language experts it was confirmed that it is true that the translation does not really convey the complete meaning. Consequently, the descriptor was changed. It is thus possible that some of the real meaning of personality descriptive words could have been lost in transcribing and translating from Xhosa to English.
Limitations regarding the clustering phase of the project were limited to the use of dictionaries, literature, and collaborative efforts from the project team to derive and cluster personality facets. In most lexical studies, statistical investigation is done through using factor analysis, which was not done in the present study. It is recommended that future studies employ both qualitative content analysis and clustering methods as well as quantitative, statistical methods. The latter will be particularly useful to compare and validate the initial categorisation and clustering derived in this study.

Furthermore, by employing dictionaries and literature as a guideline to come up with the indigenous personality structure and then “fitting” the facets identified in the Xhosa sample to the South African indigenous structure, this could have clouded the initial interpretation and development of the personality structure, which, as a result, included many universal concepts. Another limitation in this regard is that the general goal of the larger study to derive an indigenous South African personality structure took precedence when deriving and interpreting the personality-descriptive terms obtained from the initial interviews. As the goal of the larger study was to explore and develop a unified South African personality structure, the data were analysed in accordance with this goal. This meant that similar ways of interpreting responses were applied when analysing the data for a language group; in this case, for the Xhosa sample. Furthermore, when deriving the personality structure for the Xhosa sample, instead of developing the structure from scratch, the facets found in the Xhosa sample were “fitted” into the overall personality structure that was developed in the larger study. In the process, some unique aspects of the Xhosa personality structure could have been lost. However, the facets were able to highlight which aspects were more unique to the Xhosa personality structure.

The other limitation is the subjective interpretation of the personality descriptors when categories were formed. However, guidance from professionals in the field was received to make sure that the quality was good and to verify the categories.

### 7.4 Recommendations

A more representative sample of the culture should be drawn by employing a larger sample size in future research studies. It is recommended that Xhosa-speaking South Africans from other districts and provinces, and especially from rural areas, be included in future research.
It is also recommended that future research should focus on reducing the broad categories of the personality descriptive terms (facets) to group them into fewer categories, while retaining the original meaning of the personality-descriptive words.

It would seem that a lack in terminology will always remain a problem; the development of advanced dictionaries for each official language group could resolve some of the problems with translations. Another way to sort out this problem will be to check and re-check translations of data as a collaborative effort to reduce inaccurate translations.

The language translators found it difficult to translate some terms from an indigenous African language to English, and vice versa. Future studies might refrain from translating terms into English until the final facets (personality descriptive terms) have been derived.

More extensive research on the culture of the Xhosa-speaking people is needed in South Africa, as very little information on the customs and traditions of the culture is available in the literature. The results obtained from this study as well as future studies on Xhosa personality may be compared to results of personality research conducted among other South African cultures. This will enable researchers to identify universal personality constructs among all eleven culture/language groups in South Africa. By means of these universal constructs a personality inventory could be developed that will produce unbiased results in the South African context.

Foxcroft (2004) highlighted the lack of test development expertise in South Africa, although there is a clear need for psychologists with such competencies. Curricula at universities could be revised in order to ensure that future researchers are adequately trained to develop and refine psychological tests. Many researchers have a general comprehension of how to tackle test development, but there is a lack of specialised training in the application of advanced statistical and research techniques that are used in test development.

A combination of cultural and linguistic knowledge is indispensable in the development of adequate questionnaires to gather personality descriptors. It is important that future research teams combine both cultural and linguistic knowledge experts to ensure that the personality questionnaires that are developed tap the most important aspects. In addition, similar multi-disciplinary teams should be jointly involved in the data analysis phase.
7.5 Conclusion

It is well documented that the current personality assessment tools used in South Africa are not appropriate for all the cultural/language groups in South Africa. This study has identified the personality clusters and facets found in a Xhosa sample. These facets were found to resonate well with the cross-cultural facets that have emerged in a larger South African study, with an emerging South African indigenous personality structure (Nel, 2008), and with key aspects of the Five-Factor Model. The researcher believes that the findings of this study will contribute to the bigger SAPI project which intends to develop a personality inventory using an emic-etic approach that will be cross-culturally applicable in South Africa.
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## APPENDIX A

### Biographical Questionnaire

**SAPI Project – Biographical Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Which language do you speak?</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>Sepedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>Swati</td>
<td>Tsonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education attained (NQF level)</td>
<td>Higher Education and Training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Post-doctoral research degrees, Doctorates, Masters Degrees, Professional Qualifications, Honours Degrees, National First Degrees, Higher Diplomas, National Diplomas, National Certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further Education and Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>National Certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade level 9/ ABET Level 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Grade 1 to Grade 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Write down the highest Grade completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not economically active (students, homemakers, disabled, those too ill to work etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Describe the personalities of the following people:

a) A parent;
b) Eldest child or eldest brother or sister;
c) A grandparent;
d) A neighbor;
e) A person you (the respondent) don’t like;
f) Best friend of the opposite sex (not including spouse);
g) A colleague or friend from another ethnic group;
h) The teacher you most preferred (if schooled), otherwise, person from the village/town whom you like very much;
i) The teacher that you least preferred (if schooled), otherwise, a person from the village/town whom you do not like at all;
j) Best friend of the same sex.

PROBING QUESTIONS

- Please describe the following people to me by telling me what kind of person he or she is/was.
- Can you describe typical aspects of this person?
- Can you describe behaviors or habits that are characteristic of this person?
- How would you describe this person to someone who does not know him/her?
APPENDIX C

IMIBUZO NGESIXHOSA

Ndicela undichazele ukuba aba bantu balandelayo ngabantu abanjani:

a) Umzali wakho (utata/umama);
b) Umntwana wakho omdala okanye umnakwenu omdala / udade wakho omdala;
c) Umakhulu/utamkhulu;
d) Ummelwane;
e) Umntu omcaphukelayo;
f) Isihlobo sakho esisenyongweni esingesiso esi sini sakho (ingenguye umntu othatana/otshate kunye naye);
g) Umntu ophangela kunye naye/isihlobo esithetha olunye ulwimi ingesiso isiXhosa;
h) Eyona titshala wawuyithanda usafunda (ukuba uyile esikolweni) okanye umntu walapha elalini/elokishini omthanda kakhulu;
i) Utitshala wawungakholwa nguye (ukuba uyile esikolweni) okanye umntu walapha elalini/elokishini ongamthandiyo;
j) Eyona tshomi oyithandayo eyisesisini sakho.

Imibuzo ezakuncedisa ukufumana ulwazi oluphangaleleyo

- Khawundichazele ngaba bantu balandelayo ukuba ngabantu abanjani okanye babenjani besaphila?
- Khawundichazele ukuba zeziphi ezona mpawu abalasele ngazo?
- Khawundichazele ukuba yintoni adume ngayo okanye echaza lo mntu/ubuntu anguye/bakhe?
- Ungamchaza njani lo mntu kumntu ongamaziyo?
# APPENDIX D

**Initial Personality Descriptive Terms (Facets)**

**Number of words = 361**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Backstabber</th>
<th>Captivating</th>
<th>Dangerous</th>
<th>Eager to learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Bad attitude</td>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Early-riser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>Bad influence</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Economical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusing</td>
<td>Bad-mannered</td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>Eloquent/articulate/fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Balancing life</td>
<td>Cheeky</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissionable</td>
<td>Bold</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Emotional sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Choosy</td>
<td>Denigrating</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Bossy</td>
<td>Close relationship</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>Boyish</td>
<td>Clumsy</td>
<td>Desolate</td>
<td>Emulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Despising/scornful</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Comforting</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alike</td>
<td>Brilliant</td>
<td>Communicative/articulate</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>Enquiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnestic</td>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Dignified/composed</td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeasing</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Disciplining</td>
<td>Envious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciative</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Discriminating</td>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Compromising/flexible</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>Even-tempered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td>Concrete work</td>
<td>Disregarded</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Condescends</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
<td>Exploiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulative</td>
<td>Considerate/thoughtful</td>
<td>Dreamer</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Extroverted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations for others</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-seeking</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Counselling/ guiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Handsome</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>Hard-working</td>
<td>Imitating</td>
<td>Joyful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>Good person</td>
<td>Harmless</td>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>Judgmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Good relations</td>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td>Imperturbable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Good relations with another</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Good teacher</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Gossiping</td>
<td>High-minded</td>
<td>Indulgent</td>
<td>Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetful</td>
<td>Grateful</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Industrious</td>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>Home-orientated</td>
<td>Influential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Guiding</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-spirited</td>
<td>Gullible</td>
<td>Hooligan</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>Hospitable</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>like men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td>Humane</td>
<td>Insulting</td>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fussy</td>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-oriented</td>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>Interfering</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurting</td>
<td>Intimidating</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intrusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>Irrational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>Irritating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialistic</td>
<td>Observant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorable</td>
<td>Oppressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merciful</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meticulous</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Perseverant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Pessimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>Playful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughty</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neat</td>
<td>Pleasure-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needy</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neglectful</td>
<td>Pompous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomadic</td>
<td>Possess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td>Talented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Self-centered</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Rebellious/insubordinate</td>
<td>Self-enriching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Selfish</td>
<td>Territorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>Self-motivated</td>
<td>Thorough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peakekeeper</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Self-opinionated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-pleaser</td>
<td>Sharing of ideas</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Restless/discontent</td>
<td>Truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Restricting/confining</td>
<td>Short-tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-taker</td>
<td>Sickly</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>Silly</td>
<td>Undermining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Uplifting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Useless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Trait</td>
<td>Positive Adjective</td>
<td>Negative Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no-nonsense</td>
<td>Praising</td>
<td>Sleepy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nosy</td>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td>Snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nourishing</td>
<td>pretend</td>
<td>Sociable Verbally aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurturing/generous</td>
<td>Pretentious</td>
<td>Socially intelligent Verbally aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Soft Visionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>Spiteful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Story-teller Welcoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Straightforward Well-mannered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>Strict Wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>Strong-minded Womanizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocative</td>
<td>Stubborn Writer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful</td>
<td>Sulky Supportive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>