

SECOND EDITION

MAKING sense of PEOPLE

The Science of
Personality Differences

A graphic illustration at the bottom of the cover features a central white silhouette of a person standing with arms at their sides. Behind this central figure are four semi-transparent, light blue silhouettes of people, two on each side, slightly offset and overlapping. The silhouettes are simple, rounded shapes representing heads and bodies. The background of the entire cover is a solid, medium purple color.

SAMUEL BARONDES

Making Sense of People

Also by Samuel Barondes

Cellular Dynamics of the Neuron

Neuronal Recognition

Molecules and Mental Illness

Mood Genes

Better Than Prozac

Before I Sleep: Poems for Children Who Think

Making Sense of People
The Science of Personality Differences

Samuel Barondes

Second Edition

Publisher: Paul Boger
Editor-in-Chief: Amy Neidlinger
Executive Editor: Jeanne Glasser Levine
Cover Designer: Alan Clements
Managing Editor: Kristy Hart
Project Editor: Andy Beaster
Copy Editor: Language Logistics, LLC
Proofreader: Chuck Hutchinson
Indexer: Joy Lee
Compositor: Nonie Ratcliff
Manufacturing Buyer: Dan Uhrig

© 2016 by Pearson Education, Inc.
Published by Pearson Education, Inc.
Old Tappan, New Jersey 07675

For information about buying this title in bulk quantities, or for special sales opportunities (which may include electronic versions; custom cover designs; and content particular to your business, training goals, marketing focus, or branding interests), please contact our corporate sales department at corpsales@pearsoned.com or (800) 382-3419.

For government sales inquiries, please contact governmentsales@pearsoned.com.

For questions about sales outside the U.S., please contact international@pearsoned.com.

Company and product names mentioned herein are the trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

First Printing November 2015

ISBN-10: 0-13-421500-1

ISBN-13: 978-0-13-421500-6

Pearson Education LTD.

Pearson Education Australia PTY, Limited

Pearson Education Singapore, Pte. Ltd.

Pearson Education Asia, Ltd.

Pearson Education Canada, Ltd.

Pearson Educación de México, S.A. de C.V.

Pearson Education—Japan

Pearson Education Malaysia, Pte. Ltd.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015948629

For Louann

And for my grandchildren:

Jonah Lazar

Ellen Ariel

Asher Lucca

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

	Preface to Second Edition	xi
	Introduction: When Intuition Isn't Enough	i
	Part I: Describing Personality Differences	
1	Personality Traits	7
2	Troublesome Patterns	33
	Part II: Explaining Personality Differences	
3	How Genes Make Us Different	65
4	Building a Personal Brain	87
	Part III: Whole Persons, Whole Lives	
5	What's a Good Character?	111
6	Identity: Creating a Personal Story	139
7	Putting It All Together	159
	Endnotes	175
	References	199
	Acknowledgments	221
	About the Author	225
	Index	227

This page intentionally left blank

Every man is in certain respects

(a) like all other men,

(b) like some other men,

(c) like no other man.

—Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray

This page intentionally left blank

Preface to Second Edition

In 2001, after meeting Vladimir Putin for the first time, George W. Bush offered his famous impression of the Russian's personality:¹

I looked the man in the eye. I found him to be very straightforward and trustworthy and we had a good dialogue. I was able to get a sense of his soul.

Bush's assessment of Putin as straightforward and trustworthy triggered various interpretations. Some took it at face value and were relieved that the two world leaders had hit it off. Others felt that Bush had been deceived by the ex-KGB man and were alarmed by his gullibility. Still others just dismissed it as the sort of polite statement politicians make to warm up their adversaries.

Years later Bush made clear he had meant what he said. When questioned directly by Hugh Hewitt during the 2010 book tour for his memoir, *Decision Points*, Bush explained it this way:²

The reason why I said that is because I remembered him talking movingly about his mother and the cross she gave him that she had blessed in Jerusalem. Nobody knows that, and I never tried to make an explanation of why I said what I said until the book.

But Bush also saw a different side of Putin, which he revealed in a portrait he made after retiring from the presidency.³ In

contrast with his earlier assessment, the portrait does not depict Putin as being particularly trustworthy or straightforward. Instead the man Bush painted has been called poker-faced and unreadable, scary and sinister, brimming with anger, contempt, and disgust.

How did Bush arrive at this darker view of the Russian leader? Was it based on his rethinking of Putin's conduct on the world stage?

Although that would seem likely, the answer Bush gave was more personal: It had to do with Putin's disdain for Bush's beloved dog Barney. On two occasions Putin had offended Bush by mocking Barney's weakness and small size and by comparing him unfavorably with his own dog, Koni. In response Bush apparently painted the face of Putin as the face of the man who had ridiculed his dear little friend. As Bush explained it in 2014 on the *NBC Today Show*:⁴

Wow, anybody who thinks "My dog is bigger than your dog" is an interesting character. And the painting kind of reflects that.

The painting, of course, reflects more than "an interesting character." The painting also reflects the difference between what Bush is comfortable expressing on canvas and what he is comfortable expressing in words.

George W. Bush is not alone. Many of us find it difficult to articulate our views of personalities—not only to others, but also to ourselves. There's so much to consider, and it's hard to convert what we know in our minds into a useful verbal picture.

Nevertheless, we can learn to do better. Making well-crafted portraits with words is just as teachable as making them with oils or pastels. In each case what's needed is good instruction and a dedicated student.

In the first edition of this book, I explained a step-by-step system for making better verbal portraits. It combined four ways of thinking about personalities based on decades of research by psychologists and psychiatrists. It showed how the information from these four perspectives could be put together into a rich and complex picture of each unique person.

Many readers found this helpful, but others had difficulty integrating the various parts. They wanted more practical assistance in applying it to the people in their lives. Put simply, they wanted more “how to.”

This new edition is designed with those people in mind. The only substantial change I've made is to add a section, called “Practical Summary,” at the end of each chapter to discuss and illustrate applications. In these sections I also address misunderstandings and controversial points. The result I've aimed for is not only more “how to.” It's also more “here's why.” At the end of the last chapter, I sum up the benefits of integrating information from all four perspectives into an overall portrait.

As a further aid to making the book more meaningful, I would like you to pick a significant person in your life (whom I'll call P) and keep him or her in mind as you go through the book. Repeatedly relating the material to this person may help you see what each perspective adds to the whole. To keep

reminding you to do this, I will ask you to answer some relevant questions about P at the end of each Practical Summary.

Getting Started with P

To prepare for this focus on P, here are the steps to take now:

1. Pick a person you've spent a lot of time with, preferably someone who is at least 25 years old. Make this choice carefully because I'd like you to stick with it until the end of the book.
2. Think back on the first time you met P and on important experiences you've shared. Mull this over and notice what characteristics of P come to mind.
3. Now write a description of P's personality using words, phrases, sentences, and full paragraphs as you see fit. Record the description on paper or an electronic device and, when you're done, please don't change it. It will serve as a reminder of your starting point to go back to when you've finished the book. But feel free to keep a separate set of notes about P as you go from chapter to chapter.
4. When you're satisfied with your description, which may be as long or short as you like, read on.

INTRODUCTION

When Intuition Isn't Enough

All of us are personality experts. Ever since childhood, we've been paying attention to people's distinctive ways of being and trying to figure out what to expect from them. We depend on this information to get along.

Our innate ability to size people up is an amazing gift we take for granted. With it, we form an instantaneous impression of the personality of everyone we meet. Most of our assessments of people are formed in this automatic and unconscious way.¹

But there are times when we want to take a closer look by consciously and systematically evaluating someone's personality.² We may, for example, want to understand what it is about our boss that makes us avoid her. We may want to sort through the reasons we don't approve of our teenage daughter's boyfriend. We may want to decide if the person we're dating has the right stuff for a permanent relationship.

That's when the going gets tough. The difficulty mainly arises because few of us have been taught a systematic way to assess personalities. Instead, we are constantly bombarded with a contradictory mishmash of religious, moral, literary, and psychological ideas that are hard to apply in an orderly manner. Imagine how we would struggle to do simple arithmetic if we

kept getting contradictory instructions on how to work with numbers. Yet we're expected to make sense of people without having been taught a coherent arithmetic of personality.

This lack of education may be responsible for some of our biggest mistakes. It can lead us to pick the wrong suitor, take the wrong job, or misguide our children. It can cause us to misinterpret a coworker's intentions and become inappropriately defensive, or compliant, or aggressive. It can keep us from building satisfying relationships, gracefully avoiding conflicts, or developing plans to protect our interests by fighting back.

In this book, I describe a system for thinking about personalities that may help you avoid such mistakes. Based on decades of research, each chapter will make it easier for you to organize the data you already have about particular people and to start noticing characteristics that you may have overlooked. Sorting through this information will give you a clearer sense of each person and how to relate to them.

To get started, I will show you how to combine two vocabularies that professionals use to organize their observations. One breaks down personality into five well-defined tendencies, such as conscientiousness and agreeableness, each of which has several components. This makes it easier to think things through using a well-defined set of words.

The other vocabulary shifts attention from these tendencies to ten potentially troublesome patterns of behavior, such as compulsiveness or paranoia. Mild versions of these patterns may simply be notable parts of a well-functioning personality. But some of us have inflexible and maladaptive versions of one or a few of them, versions that frequently bring grief to those

we deal with—and to ourselves. More than the rest of us, such people are prisoners of personality who are locked into ways of being they seem unable to escape.

Combining these two easy-to-learn vocabularies will not only help you make clearer assessments of everyone you meet, but will also raise questions about the reasons people get to be so different from each other. In the second part of the book, I will describe the development of the brain circuits that control our distinctive combinations of tendencies and patterns. I will also show that the decades-long developmental process that builds these brain circuits is strongly influenced by the two great accidents of our birth: the specific set of genes we happen to be born with and the specific world we happen to live in.

But there's more to a personality than tendencies and patterns. In the third part of the book, I will turn to the values and goals that give meaning and purpose to people's lives. To flesh out this view, I will show you how to apply universal and culture-specific standards of morality to assess that aspect of personality called character. I will also encourage you to pay attention to the stories people tell about their personal history and future plans, which will help you figure out what they stand for and their sense of identity.

Systematically organizing all this information about tendencies, patterns, character, and identity will help you make sense of anyone. It may also influence the approach you choose to engage with them. In some cases, this may encourage you to shrug off their disquieting idiosyncrasies in favor of forgiveness and compassion. In other cases, it may alert you to telltale signs of danger so that you can take protective actions. In still

other cases, it may open your heart to warm feelings of love and respect. In all cases, it will enhance your appreciation of human diversity in the same way that those who know a lot about wine, or music, or baseball get the added pleasure that comes from thoughtful attention to the details. Augmenting your pleasure in understanding and dealing with people, whether you like them or not, is the main aim of this book.

This page intentionally left blank

Personality Traits

When I was in high school, I signed up for the student newspaper. To get me started, the editor offered some standard advice on how to write a story. He said I should be sure to answer five questions: What happened? Who was involved? When? Where? Why? He said that knowing about these “five Ws” served as a check for completeness because novices sometimes left out one or more of them. He then assured me that I wouldn’t need them for long because answering these questions was something I was already inclined to do intuitively.

Intuition is also what journalists rely on when they size up people. Through years of practice, they develop a knack for identifying distinctive personality traits and finding the words to describe them. The gifted among them are so good at it that they can create a revealing portrait in a single paragraph. Consider, for example, Joe Klein’s description of the personality of an American politician:

There was a physical, almost carnal, quality to his public appearances. He embraced audiences and was aroused by them in turn. His sonar was remarkable in retail political situations. He seemed able to sense what audiences needed and deliver it to

them—trimming his pitch here, emphasizing different priorities there, always aiming to please. This was one of his most effective, and maddening qualities in private meetings as well: He always grabbed on to some point of agreement, while steering the conversation away from larger points of disagreement—leaving his seducee with the distinct impression that they were in total harmony about everything. ... There was a needy, high cholesterol quality to it all; the public seemed enthralled by his vast, messy humanity. Try as he might to keep in shape, jogging for miles with his pale thighs jiggling, he still tended to a raw fleshiness. He was famously addicted to junk food. He had a reputation as a womanizer. All of these were of a piece.¹

Notice that Klein needs only a handful of evocative words to highlight the main characteristics of his subject: carnal, needy, messy, maddening, fleshiness, addicted, and womanizer. To round out his description, he uses a few short phrases, such as “his sonar was remarkable,” “high cholesterol quality,” and “aiming to please.” When he can’t find a simple word or phrase to describe something that he considers particularly revealing, he makes up a whole sentence: “he always grabbed on to some point of agreement, while steering the conversation away from larger points of disagreement—leaving his seducee with the distinct impression that they were in total harmony about everything.” By using words and phrases that all of us can understand, Klein tells us a great deal about the personality of an extraordinary public figure: Bill Clinton.

The combination of words and phrases is, of course, critical. There are other people who are needy but who are neither carnal nor womanizers. Some of them may also have remarkable sonar but without being messy or maddening. What makes Klein's description so recognizable is that, as he points out, all the traits "were of a piece."

So how did Klein do it? Was he intuitively asking himself a set of questions that are as obvious to him as the five Ws? Did he leave out anything important? Can we learn a technique to make our own descriptions of people more incisive and complete?

Words from the Dictionary

The development of a simple technique to describe personalities was set in motion in the 1930s by Gordon Allport, a professor of psychology at Harvard. Although Allport was well aware of the uniqueness of each individual, he also knew that scientific fields get started by breaking down complex systems into simple components. Just as understanding the great variety of chemical compounds depended on identifying a limited number of elements, understanding the great variety of personalities may depend on identifying a limited number of critical ingredients. But what exactly are those ingredients?

Allport's answer was traits: the enduring dispositions to act and think and feel in certain ways that are described by words found in all human languages. Just as chemical elements such as carbon and hydrogen can combine with many others to form endless numbers of complicated substances, traits such as

being outgoing and being reliable can combine with many others to form endless numbers of complicated personalities. But how many traits are there? And how could Allport find out?

To answer this question, Allport and his colleague, H.S. Odbert, made a list of the words about personality from *Webster's New International Dictionary*.² By analyzing this list, they hoped to identify the essential components of personality that were so obvious to our ancestors that they invented a great many words to describe them. Instead of just concocting an inventory of personality traits out of their own heads, Allport and Odbert would be guided by the cumulative verbal creations of countless minds over countless generations, as recorded in a dictionary.³

It soon became clear that these researchers had bitten off more than they could chew. The list of words "to distinguish the behavior of one human being from another" had 17,953 entries! Faced with this staggering number, they whittled it down using several criteria. First, they eliminated about a third, such as *attractive*, because the entries were considered evaluative rather than essential: "[W]hen we say a woman is attractive, we are talking not about a disposition 'inside the skin' but about her effect on other people."⁴ Another fourth hit the cutting room floor because they described temporary states of mind, such as *frantic* and *rejoicing*, rather than the enduring dispositions that are defining features of personality traits. Others were thrown out because they were considered ambiguous. In the end, about 4,500 entries met the researchers' criteria for stable traits.

This doesn't mean that personality has 4,500 different components; many of the words on the list are easily identifiable as synonyms. For example, *outgoing* and *sociable* are used interchangeably. Furthermore, antonyms, such as *solitary*, describe the same general category of behavior, but at its opposite pole—instead of saying “not sociable” or “not outgoing,” we might say “solitary.” In fact, a wonderful feature of natural language is that it lends itself so well to a graded (or dimensional) description of specific components of personality, from extremely outgoing at one pole to extremely solitary at the other, with modifiers to specify points in between. Put simply, the ancestors who gradually built our language—and all languages—left us with many choices for describing ingredients of personality.

Recognizing that *outgoing* and *solitary* both refer to aspects of an identical trait, how many other words also fit into this category? When I looked up *outgoing* in my thesaurus, I found these synonyms, among others: *gregarious*, *companionable*, *convivial*, *friendly*, and *jovial*. When I looked up *solitary*, I got, among others, *retiring*, *isolated*, *lonely*, *private*, and *friendless*. This tells me that the group of experts who put together this thesaurus decided that all these words belong in a box that can be labeled Outgoing–Solitary. Needless to say, each word in the box may also have some special spin of its own. For example, *solitary*, *lonely*, and *private* don't mean exactly the same thing, and writers such as Joe Klein may mull them over to get just the right one. Nevertheless, we all know that these words have a lot in common. To psychologists such as Allport, they all refer to a single overarching trait.

Beyond Synonyms and Antonyms

Does this mean that we can identify the essential building blocks of personality by simply getting a list from a dictionary and then lumping together the synonyms and antonyms from a thesaurus? Can we base a nomenclature of personality on the analysis of professional lexicographers? Or can we use a more open-source approach that pays attention to the ways ordinary people employ words to describe personalities?

The answer psychologists settled on was both. First, professionals reduced the list to a more manageable number—about a thousand. Then they asked ordinary people to use these words to describe themselves and their acquaintances. To get an idea of the way this was done, please apply the ten words in the following list to someone you know well. In expressing your opinion, use a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 indicating that the person ranks very high, 1 indicating that the person ranks very low, and the other numbers indicating that the person falls somewhere in between.

- | | |
|----------------|---------------|
| 1. Outgoing | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. Bold | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. Talkative | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. Energetic | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. Assertive | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. Reliable | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. Practical | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. Hardworking | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. Organized | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. Careful | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

I have no way of knowing what numbers you selected. But chances are good that they will have a characteristic relationship: The numbers you picked for the first five items probably are similar, and the numbers you picked for the second five items probably are similar. Furthermore, I can say with confidence that most people who give someone a certain score for *outgoing* give them a similar score for *bold*, *talkative*, *energetic*, and *assertive*; and that the score they give someone for *reliable* is likely similar to the one they give for *practical*, *hardworking*, *organized*, and *careful*. Even though none of the words in each quintet are synonyms, people who are ranked a certain way on one word from each tend to get similar scores on the others. In contrast, people's scores on the first quintet are independent of their scores on the second quintet. This implies that these nonsynonymous words are grouped together in our minds because each refers to some aspect of a related component of personality.

Could any other words be lumped together with *outgoing* or *reliable* to flesh out these two big categories? How many other groupings like this would be discovered if people were asked to make judgments using all the thousand words that the original list was pared down to? And what statistical techniques would be needed to identify these categories? In making the list, Allport set the stage for research on these questions.⁵

Bundling Traits

A statistical technique for studying the relationships between these words was invented in the nineteenth century by Francis Galton, a founder of modern research on personality, whom

you read more about later. The technique is used to calculate a correlation coefficient, a number between 1.0 and -1.0 that measures the degree of sameness (positive correlation) or oppositeness (negative correlation). Although Galton invented the technique for other purposes, he also happened to be interested in categorizing the words that we use for personality traits,⁶ and he would have been pleased to learn about this application.

To get a feel for this calculation, let's think about the positive correlations we would find if we asked people to rank someone on *outgoing*, *sociable*, and *gregarious* by using a scale of 1 to 7. Knowing that these words are synonyms, we would expect to find that if John ranks Mary a 6 on *outgoing*, he likely will rank her around 6 on each of the others. If he then ranks Jane as a 4 on *outgoing*, he likely will rank her around 4 on each of the others. And if Jennifer ranks Jim a 1 on *outgoing*, she likely will rank him around 1 on each of the others. Plugging these scores into Galton's formula would indicate a great deal of sameness.

Now what sort of correlations would we find between the words in the first nonsynonymous quintet (outgoing–bold–talkative–energetic–assertive)? Studies show that these words are correlated strongly, but not as strongly as synonyms, and similar positive correlations are found among the words in the second nonsynonymous quintet (reliable–practical–hard-working–organized–careful). In contrast, when we compare the scores for words such as *outgoing* from the first group with

words such as *reliable* from the second group, we don't find a correlation. This comes as no surprise because we all know that being outgoing and being reliable are not intrinsically related.

Determining the correlations among five or ten words is fairly easy. But determining the correlations among a thousand words was stalled until researchers could turn it over to a computer. To get the raw data, thousands of ordinary people were asked to apply each of these words by ranking their applicability to themselves or another person using a scale of 1 to 7. The mass of data was then analyzed with a more advanced statistical technique, called *factor analysis*, which measures the correlation between each word and all the others and organizes the correlations into clusters. In this way, some words were identified as highly correlated to each other, making them good representatives of a particular cluster of traits, each of which can be thought of as a general tendency.

By the early 1980s, the results were in: The words that describe personality traits can be boiled down to just five tendencies (see Table 1.1), which Lewis Goldberg named the Big Five.⁷ Each of these tendencies has been given a reasonably descriptive name: Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), Neuroticism (N), and Openness (O). If you have trouble recalling these names at first, as I did, you can use the acronyms OCEAN or CANOE to jog your memory until they become second nature.

TABLE 1.1 The Big Five: Representative Words

	High	Low
Extraversion vs. Introversion	Outgoing, bold, talkative, energetic, assertive	Withdrawn, timid, silent, reserved, shy
Agreeableness vs. Antagonism	Warm, kind, cooperative, trusting, generous	Cold, unkind, uncooperative, suspicious, stingy
Conscientiousness vs. Disinhibition	Reliable, practical, hardworking, organized, careful	Unreliable, impractical, lazy, disorganized, negligent
Neuroticism vs. Emotional Stability	Tense, unstable, discontented, irritable, insecure	Relaxed, stable, contented, imperturbable, secure
Openness vs. Closedness	Imaginative, curious, reflective, creative, sophisticated	Unimaginative, uninquisitive, unreflective, uncreative, unsophisticated

Using the Big Five

After the Big Five were discovered, they became the foundation for assessing individual differences in the ways people interact with their social and physical worlds. Three tendencies—Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism—mainly relate to ways of interacting with other people. The other two—Conscientiousness and Openness—are more general.⁸

- **Extraversion is the tendency to actively reach out to others.** People high in Extraversion are stimulated by the social world, like to be the center of attention, and often take charge. They also like excitement and are inclined to be upbeat, fun loving, full of energy, and to experience positive emotions. People low in Extraversion are less interested in interpersonal interactions and tend to be reserved and quiet. But their relative lack of interest in being with people need not indicate that they don't like them or that they are socially anxious or depressed; they may just prefer to be alone.
- **Agreeableness is the tendency to be altruistic, cooperative, and good-natured.** People high in Agreeableness are considerate, compassionate, helpful, and willing to compromise. They truly like people and assume that everyone is decent and trustworthy. People low on Agreeableness are more self-interested than altruistic, more competitive than cooperative, and likely to be skeptical of others' intentions. They also tend to be cold, antagonistic, and disrespectful of the rights of others.
- **Conscientiousness is the tendency to control impulses and to tenaciously pursue goals.** People high in Conscientiousness are orderly, reliable, hardworking, neat, and punctual. They tend to plan ahead and think things through. They are more interested in long-term than short-term goals. People low in Conscientiousness are more spontaneous, less constrained, less dutiful, and less achievement-oriented. Although Conscientiousness

shows up prominently in the performance of tasks, it also influences interpersonal relationships.

- **Neuroticism is the tendency to have negative feelings, particularly in reaction to perceived social threats.** People high in Neuroticism are emotionally unstable, tend to be upset by minor threats or frustrations, and are often in a bad mood. They are prone to anxiety, depression, embarrassment, self-doubt, self-consciousness, anger, and guilt. People low on Neuroticism are emotionally stable, calm, composed, and unflappable. But their freedom from negative feelings does not imply that they are particularly inclined to have positive feelings.
- **Openness is the tendency to be imaginative and to enjoy novelty and variety.** People who are high in Openness tend to be artistic, nonconforming, intellectual, aware of their feelings, and comfortable with new ideas. People low in Openness prefer the simple, straightforward, familiar, and obvious to the complex, ambiguous, novel, and subtle. They tend to be conventional, conservative, and resistant to change. Although people who are high on Openness enjoy the life of the mind, Openness is not identical to intelligence. Highly intelligent people can be high or low on O.

After you've mulled over the broad meanings of these five domains, you can get a better sense of them by applying them to someone you know. You might start by asking yourself how outgoing, good-natured, reliable, moody, and creative that

person is compared with others. In doing this, you will notice that the person's relative rankings vary somewhat depending on the situation.⁹ For example, a person may be outgoing with friends but shy with strangers, so you have to decide on the average scores by summing up the many observations you've made.¹⁰ From this, you will come away with a profile of the person's basic tendencies, such as moderately extraverted, very agreeable and conscientious, a little neurotic, and very open. Although this is no more than a rough summary of how you regard this person, the Big Five framework will have helped you put your intuitive assessments into words. You will then be in a position to more thoughtfully compare this person with others by seeing his or her differences more clearly.¹¹

Big Five 2.0

Having made such assessments, you may find that your ideas about each category are still fuzzy. To sharpen your appraisal of a person's profile of traits, it helps to move from a holistic impression to a more meticulous examination. To do this, you need to learn more about the details of the Big Five.

Paul Costa and Robert McCrae have done the most to clarify these details. Working together at the National Institutes of Health in the 1980s, they developed a questionnaire called the NEO PI-R, which uses phrases rather than adjectives.¹² The big advantage of using phrases is that you can design them to eliminate some of the ambiguity that is inherent in single words. For example, in place of the word *insecure*, a component of Neuroticism, Costa and McCrae use phrases that spell out

certain aspects, such as “In dealing with people, I always dread making a social blunder” and “I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.”¹³

Another reason for the popularity of the NEO PI-R is that it sharpens the assessment of each of the Big Five by subdividing them into six components, called facets. This ensures a more complete evaluation and helps focus attention on specific individual differences. Consider, for example, these phrases that assess facets of Extraversion:

- I find it easy to smile and be outgoing with strangers.
(Warmth/Friendliness)
- I enjoy parties with lots of people. (Gregariousness)
- I am dominant, forceful, and assertive. (Assertiveness)
- My life is fast-paced. (Activity)
- I love the excitement of roller coasters.
(Excitement-Seeking)
- I am a cheerful, high-spirited person. (Positive Emotions/Cheerfulness)

The advantage of using these facets is that it may help you make distinctions that you might have glossed over. For example, many people with an average E score are not average across the board. Some may be somewhat higher on warmth, gregariousness, and positive emotions than on assertiveness, activity, and excitement-seeking; others may have a different balance. The same is true for the other tendencies. In each

case, you should pay particular attention to facets that stand out as clearly higher or lower than average. Because the whole point of the exercise is to compare people with each other, you're really looking for these distinguishing characteristics. You may also take note of particular situations in which these distinguishing characteristics are expressed.

To get a feel for the facets of the Big Five, I encourage you to take a free computer-based personality test that resembles the proprietary one devised by Costa and McCrea, at www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/5/j5j/IPIP/ipipneo120.htm. Developed by a group of distinguished personality researchers¹⁴ and overseen by John A. Johnson¹⁵ at Pennsylvania State University, it uses different names for some of the facets but covers similar ground. This free test, called the IPIP, can be taken anonymously in about 20 minutes. If you take it, you will receive an automated email report that shows your relative rankings on the Big Five and its facets by comparing your scores with those of the hundreds of thousands of other people who have already taken it.

To gain more experience with the facets of the Big Five (Table 1.2), you may also use the online questionnaire to assess the familiar person (P) I asked you to select in the Preface. Doing this will sharpen your view of P and help persuade you of the usefulness of this approach. As you become more familiar with the Big Five, the aim is to learn to do some rough scoring in your head (high, medium, or low) without having to rely on a questionnaire.

TABLE 1.2 Facets of the Big Five*

Extraversion

Warmth/Friendliness (makes friends easily)

Gregariousness (likes the company of others)

Assertiveness (likes to take charge)

Activity (likes to be busy)

Excitement-Seeking (likes thrills)

Positive Emotions/Cheerfulness (is prone to feel happy)

Agreeableness

Trust (assumes people have good intentions)

Straightforwardness/Morality (is candid, avoids deception)

Altruism (finds helping others rewarding, is not exploitative)

Compliance/Cooperation (prefers compromise to opposition)

Modesty (is not boastful)

Tender-Mindedness/Sympathy (is kind, compassionate)

Conscientiousness

Competence/Self-Efficacy (can accomplish things)

Order/Orderliness (is well organized, makes plans)

Dutifulness (is highly reliable)

Achievement-Striving (works to achieve excellence)

Self-Discipline (has willpower)

Deliberation/Cautiousness (takes time making decisions)

Neuroticism

Anxiety (is prone to fearfulness)

Angry Hostility (is prone to feel resentful)

Depression (is prone to feel discouraged, pessimistic)

Self-Consciousness (is shy because of fear of rejection)
 Impulsiveness/Immoderation (has difficulty resisting urges)
 Vulnerability (loses poise under pressure)

Openness

Fantasy/Imagination (tries to create a more interesting world)
 Aesthetics/Artistic Interests (loves beauty in art and nature)
 Feelings/Emotionality (is aware of own feelings)
 Actions/Adventurousness (is eager to try new activities)
 Ideas/Intellect (likes to play with ideas)
 Values/Liberalism (is ready to challenge convention)

* When the facets have different names in the proprietary (NEO PI-R) and nonproprietary (IPIP) tests, I've listed both.

Rethinking Bill Clinton

Another way to get a feel for the Big Five and its facets is to keep it in mind while re-examining the paragraph from Joe Klein's book that I cited at the start of this chapter. Klein tells us much more about Clinton's personality than he packed into this paragraph. But for our purpose, I mainly stick to those 165 words:

There was a physical, almost carnal, quality to his public appearances. He embraced audiences and was aroused by them in turn. His sonar was remarkable in retail political situations. He seemed able to sense what audiences needed and deliver it to them—trimming his pitch here, emphasizing different priorities there, always aiming to please. This was one of his

most effective, and maddening qualities in private meetings as well: He always grabbed on to some point of agreement, while steering the conversation away from larger points of disagreement—leaving his seducee with the distinct impression that they were in total harmony about everything. ... There was a needy, high cholesterol quality to it all; the public seemed enthralled by his vast, messy humanity. Try as he might to keep in shape, jogging for miles with his pale thighs jiggling, he still tended to a raw fleshiness. He was famously addicted to junk food. He had a reputation as a womanizer. All of these were of a piece.

As noted before, Klein built his description by calling attention to a few key attributes. But now we can translate the information that Klein provides into the language of the Big Five. Needless to say, much more is known about Clinton, and other observers have painted a somewhat different picture than Klein did.¹⁶ But let's stick with the paragraph and some other information from his book to illustrate how the Big Five and its facets can help us organize our thoughts about Clinton's basic tendencies. To do this, I will concentrate on facets in which his scores are notably high or low.

Starting with Extraversion is particularly fitting when considering Clinton because he loves to be the center of attention. Klein emphasizes this with evocative terms for his public appearances, such as “embraced audiences” and “aroused by them,” which translate into very high scores on gregariousness. Clinton is also obviously high on assertiveness, which led him

to the most powerful leadership roles, and “womanizer” can be considered partly a reflection of high excitement-seeking. From this and everything else Klein tells us, Clinton ranks high on all facets of Extraversion, and his overall score is at the top of the chart.

Klein also gives us some information about Agreeableness, but Clinton’s score isn’t quite so obvious. From the paragraph, you may first get the impression that he ranks high on A because he is “always aiming to please.” But as you read on, you will realize that he’s just telling his “seduces” whatever they want to hear. In the course of his book, Klein gives many other examples of Clinton’s deceptiveness, which gives him a low score on straightforwardness. Klein also presents evidence that Clinton’s womanizing is exploitative, which lowers his score on altruism and sympathy. When taken together, Clinton’s Agreeableness, which appears very high on first meeting him, is lower than it seems.

The information we get about Conscientiousness is limited but revealing. The part about jogging indicates an effort at self-discipline. But this impression is tempered by “try as he might to keep in shape,” “raw fleshiness,” “addicted to junk food,” and “womanizer,” which are hardly testimony to high C. So even though Klein’s paragraph leaves out Clinton’s very high achievement-striving, the lower scores for dutifulness, cautiousness, and deliberation that he documents in other parts of the book combine to give a lower than average ranking on Conscientiousness.

Klein’s paragraph tells us little about Neuroticism except for a hint about “messy humanity.” Other sections of the book

tell us that Clinton can get very angry and out of control, but there's no reason to think of him as being especially prone to negative emotions. In fact, he is unusually capable of brushing off criticism that would make most of us crumble, and he can be cool under extreme fire. When taken together, Clinton ranks below average on Neuroticism.

Openness to experience is also not explicitly considered. This omission is not unusual in brief descriptions of people, even though it may turn out to be a distinguishing feature of their personalities. But Klein makes up for this in the rest of the book by providing us with persuasive evidence that Clinton ranks high on most facets of O.

Of course, much about Clinton doesn't show up in this Big Five profile. But to illustrate the usefulness of this way of describing him, let's compare it with a similar assessment of another president, Barack Obama, as a way of thinking about their differences. Like Clinton, we have had many opportunities to see Obama in action. Furthermore, his two autobiographies fill in many blanks.¹⁷

In making this comparison, Openness doesn't tell us much. Although Clinton and Obama differ in their scores on certain facets, their overall rankings are both high. But their relative scores on Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness are informative. When taken together, very different profiles emerge.

Extraversion is particularly notable because Obama's overall score is not only lower than Clinton's, but also lower than the scores of most other successful politicians. Although Obama ranks very high on assertiveness and activity, he is

not particularly warm or gregarious. Nor does he show much evidence of positive emotion, even when winning a historic election or a Nobel Prize. Klein, who has also written about Obama's personality, offered evidence of his low E from a politician who helped coach Obama for debates during his first presidential campaign: "He is a classic loner...Usually you work hard at prep, and then everyone, including the candidate, kicks back and has a meal together. Obama would go off and eat by himself. He is very self-contained. He is not needy."¹⁸

This low neediness is another sign of Obama's difference from Clinton: his very low Neuroticism. Whereas Clinton deserves credit for generally controlling resentment and discouragement, Obama doesn't seem to feel them at all, even in the face of strong setbacks. In fact, his remarkable emotional stability, which many admire, has also been criticized as Spock-like. Maureen Dowd, another journalist with a gift for describing personalities, called him "President Cool" and "No Drama Obama."¹⁹

This coolness might also be taken as a sign of low Agreeableness. But Obama clearly ranks high on several of its facets, especially straightforwardness and a preference for cooperation and compromise. Although he does not exude either altruism or tender-mindedness, his behavior suggests that they are at least average. So even though Obama is not especially high on Agreeableness, I consider him to be higher than he might seem.

Obama's high marks on all six facets of Conscientiousness also distinguish him from Clinton. He ranks especially high on deliberation, examining all sides of a problem. As with

other personality traits, this can be seen as a mixed blessing, bringing him praise for his thoughtfulness but criticism that he is too professorial and indecisive.

Considering Obama and Clinton in this way shows how the Big Five can help us organize our intuitive observations by making them explicit. Although the profiles that it generates are sketchy, the process focuses our attention on the full range of tendencies, including some that we might otherwise have overlooked. And as you will see, the findings we make in this way provide a framework for describing the personality patterns discussed in the next chapter.

Practical Summary

In this chapter I've shown you how to organize your initial thoughts about a personality by using the Big Five. To supplement what you've learned, I urge you to take the free online test I mentioned earlier if you haven't already done so: www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/5/jsj/IPIP/ipip-neo120.htm

The test is a valuable instrument that resembles those professionals use as part of a formal personality assessment. Taking it, and reviewing the results the program sends back, will tell you how your scores compare with those of the hundreds of thousands of other people in the database. It will also help you apply the Big Five to others.

But you can't use a 120-item questionnaire to size up someone in everyday life. Instead you will have to become

sufficiently familiar with the Big Five to make an informal survey in your mind.

AN INFORMAL BIG FIVE SURVEY

To make a mental survey, it's easiest to work in an established sequence. I always use the sequence E-A-C-N-O, as in the Bill Clinton example, and suggest you use it too. As with Clinton, I skim through the facets looking for any that are high or low and wind up with a rough sketch. In his case my assessment was: extremely high E, mixed A and C, lower than average N, and high O.

As you gain experience you, too, will be able to quickly sum up your observations in this way. You may also start looking at the Big Five not only as a collection of traits but also as five *general tendencies* that are operating at particular intensities. To give you some practice in making such quick assessments, please think through the many people you know and try to pick out the ones who rank highest or lowest on each of the Big Five. For convenience here, again, is a summary:

- **Extraversion (vs. Introversion):** The tendency to actively reach out to others.
- **Agreeableness (vs. Antagonism):** The tendency to be altruistic, cooperative, and good-natured.
- **Conscientiousness (vs. Disinhibition):** The tendency to control impulses and tenaciously pursue goals.

- **Neuroticism (vs. Emotional Stability):** The tendency to have negative feelings, particularly in reaction to perceived social threats.
- **Openness (vs. Closedness):** The tendency to be imaginative and to enjoy novelty and variety.

This exercise doesn't only give you some practice in assessing these tendencies. It also calls your attention to inconsistencies. For example, you may know a person with high E who, paradoxically, avoids large crowds. Though this doesn't seem to fit with his strong tendency to reach out to others, it turns out that strangers make him uneasy and that he has other signs of high N. The result is that his high E, which operates freely in the company of familiar people, is overridden by a situation that dials up his N.

This example shows that applying the Big Five is not as simple as it might seem. Behavior is greatly influenced by situations, and assessing tendencies must take this into account. Furthermore, the five general tendencies are continuously interacting with each other. Their complex interactions, their situational constraints, and the degree of harmony between them are, in fact, major causes of the distinctiveness and diversity of personalities.

P AND THE BIG FIVE

At the end of the Preface, I asked you to pick a person (P) you know well and to write a description of his or her personality (from this point forward, P will be referred to

as *female*). If you didn't get around to it then, please do it now, and continue to keep P in mind as you read on.

Now give P a rough score (such as high, medium, or low) on E, A, C, N, and O.

Having recorded these scores, please answer the following:

1. Do you now find it easier to put your thoughts about P into words?
2. Do you now have a clearer impression of some distinctive aspects of her personality?
3. Did you notice anything you left out of your initial description that you now consider a significant omission?
4. Do you believe some inconsistencies you've noticed may be thought of as conflicts of tendencies?

If you're prepared to spend more time on the Big Five, you may wish to go back to the online test, put yourself in P's shoes, and try to answer each question from what you believe to be her point of view. The report that you receive by return email will turn this into a profile and supplement the informal one you've already made. This will tell you if you picked up something from the test that you missed in your informal evaluation.

As you continue through the book, the Big Five will keep coming up, and you will have many opportunities to increase your facility in using it. Now you're ready to learn to combine it with other ways of thinking about personalities.

Acknowledgments

Making Sense of People grew out of my lifelong curiosity about personality differences. Writing this book gave me the opportunity to organize my thoughts and find out what's new in the field.

In surveying the vast literature on personality, I benefited greatly from the writings of many scholars, a few of whom I'd like to single out. On personality traits: Paul Costa, Lewis Goldberg, Robert McCrae, and Walter Mischel. On troublesome personality patterns: Aaron T. Beck, Theodore Millon, John Livesley, John Oldham, and Thomas Widiger. On the genetics of personality: David Goldman, Ken Kendler, Robert Plomin, and Daniel Weinberger. On stability and change in personality: Avshalom Caspi and Brent Roberts. On morality and character: Robert Cloninger, Jonathan Haidt, Christopher Peterson, Martin Seligman, Richard Shweder, and Frans de Waal. On identity and life stories: Dan McAdams. Thank you all.

This book was made possible by longstanding support from the University of California, which has provided me with an exceptional intellectual environment for more than 40 years—first at its San Diego campus (UCSD) and, since 1986, at its San Francisco campus (UCSF). Throughout this period I also benefited greatly from research funding from

the National Institutes of Health and from private foundations, especially The McKnight Foundation. I would also like to acknowledge the friendship and support of Jeanne and Sandy Robertson, who helped me establish the Center for Neurobiology and Psychiatry at UCSF, and of Shari and Garen Staglin, who assisted in its further development through grants from The Staglin Music Festival for Mental Health and The International Mental Health Research Organization (IMHRO).

I discussed this book with many colleagues and received valuable suggestions from Steve Hamilton, Adrienne Larkin, John Livesley, Liz Perle, and Steve Rosen. I am also grateful for personal help from other colleagues: Peter Carroll, Glenn Chertow, Kerry Cho, Arkady Gendelman, James Ostroff, Lisa Vail, Nancy Ascher, Steve Tomlanovich, and Ayman Naseri. And I thank Jody Williams for assistance with the bibliography.

Special thanks go to my agent, Lisa Queen, for her perseverance, wisdom, thoughtfulness, good humor, and for guiding me through the changing world of book publishing. I also thank Kirk Jensen, who edited the first edition, and the outstanding professionals at Pearson who assisted in its production, especially project editor Andy Beaster, copy editor Chrissy White, cover designer Chuti Prasertsith, and compositor Nonie Ratcliff. And I am grateful to Amy Neidlinger who commissioned and oversaw the second edition.

Finally I'd like to thank a few members of my family, who each keep teaching me a lot about personality. I am fortunate to have my daughters, Elizabeth and Jessica, who are so close

to each other and so close to me. I am fortunate to have my loving grandchildren, Jonah, Ellen, and Asher, my son-in-law Benjamin, and my stepson Whitney. And I am particularly fortunate to have my wife and soul mate, Louann Brizendine, who finishes my sentences, reads my mind, and keeps me continually inspired and entertained. My cup runneth over.

This page intentionally left blank

About the Author

Samuel Barondes is the Jeanne and Sanford Robertson Professor and Director of the Center for Neurobiology and Psychiatry at the University of California School of Medicine in San Francisco. He was trained in psychiatry and neuroscience at Columbia, Harvard, and the National Institutes of Health and has been at the University of California since 1970. He is the author of more than 200 research articles and has held many administrative and advisory positions, including Director of UCSF's Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute, President of the McKnight Endowment Fund for Neuroscience, and Chair of the Board of Scientific Counselors of the National Institute of Mental Health. He has received many honors, including membership in the National Academy of Medicine and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In addition to his research publications, Barondes has written three books about psychiatry for a general audience as well as a children's poetry book: *Before I Sleep: Poems for Children Who Think*. He lives in Sausalito, California, with his wife, Louann Brizendine.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

A

abuse patterns, 97-100

Adams, John, 131

adenine, 74

Agreeableness (A)

definition of, 17

examples

Barack Obama, 27

Bill Clinton, 25, 161

Steve Jobs, 152

facets of, 22

heritability of, 72

high/low scorers

nouns for, 33

tradeoffs, 81, 83

personality patterns

antisocial, 45-47

narcissistic, 43-45

paranoid, 42-43

representative words, 16

Allport, Gordon and personality traits

researching/developing, 9-11, 13

separating traits from character,

116-117, 133

American Psychiatric

Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM),

34-35

amphetamine, 79

amygdala, 90

anger as moral emotion, 122-123

antisocial behaviors, 97-100

antisocial personality pattern

definition of, 34, 58

examples of, 45-47

I'm special opinion, 54-55, 161

apoptosis, 91

Apple, 150-151

The Art of Virtue, 114-115, 130

The Audacity of Hope, 167

Autobiography (Benjamin Franklin), 148

avoidant personality pattern

definition of, 34, 58

example of, 49-51

I'm vulnerable opinion,

54-55, 161

axons, 89, 91

B

Bardem, Javier, 46-47

Beck, Aaron T., 53

Big Five tendencies. *See also*

specific personality traits

assessments

of Barack Obama, 26-28,

161-167

of Benjamin Franklin, 115

of Bill Clinton, 23-28, 161-167

character factors, 133
 facets of, 20-23
 foundation for personal interactions, 15-18
 IPIP questionnaire, 21
 NEO PI-R questionnaire, 20
 OCEAN and CANOE, acronyms for, 15
 personality patterns
 importance of, 56-57
 troublesome patterns, 60-61
 representative words for, 16
 stabilization of scores, 105-106

borderline personality pattern

definition of, 34, 58
 example of, 52-53
 I'm vulnerable opinion, 54, 56, 161

Bouchard, Thomas, 72-73

boutons, 89-90

brain development, 88-89. *See also genes/gene expression*

adolescent changes, 103-105
 childhood to adulthood
 continuity, 94-96
 completion of, 105-106
 critical periods of, 92-94
 environment

effect on gene expression, 100-102
 versus genes, 97-100
 influence of, 92-94

MRI and fMRI imaging, 104

patterns, persistence of, 94-97

terminology

amygdala, 90
 apoptosis, 91
 axons, 89, 91
 boutons, 89-90

brain circuits, maturation of, 90-91

brain circuits, myelination of, 91

dendrites, 89-90

hypothalamus, 91

neurons, 89-91

neurotransmitters, 90, 98

synapses/synaptic signaling, 90

Brando, Marlon, 41

Bush, George W., 43

C

CANOE, acronym for Big

 Five, 15

Chamberlain, Lisa, 44

character

 Benjamin Franklin

analysis of, 128-133

example of, 111-115

as publicist, 148

 importance of, 133-134

 moral instincts and emotions, effect on, 119-124

 separation

of character from

personality, 115-119

of cultural values from

character judgment,

 126-128

 virtues/strengths

Ben Franklin's list, 112-115

universal list, 124-126

chastity virtue, 113

Chess, Stella, 94

Childhood and Society, 87-88

cleanliness virtue, 113

Clinton, Bill

- Big Five assessment, 23-28
- comparison with Barack Obama, 26-28, 161-167
- Joe Klein's description of, 7-9
- life stories, example, 164-167

Cloninger, Robert, 125

compassion as moral emotion, 122-123

compulsive personality pattern

- definition of, 35, 59
- example of, 47-49
- I'm right opinion, 54-55, 161

Conscientiousness (C)

- definition of, 18
- examples
 - Barack Obama, 27, 161*
 - Bill Clinton, 25, 161*
- facets of, 22
- heritability of, 72
- high/low scorers, tradeoffs, 81-82
- personality patterns,
 - compulsive, 47-49
 - representative words, 16

contempt as moral emotion, 122-123

cooperativeness as character component, 125, 134

Costa, Paul, 19-20, 36

courage virtue, 125, 131, 134

Covey, Stephen, 129

Crashing the Party, 43

cultural values and character strengths

- separation in judgments, 126-128
- universal character strengths, 124-126

cytosine, 74

D

Dallas, Jason, 65-66, 76

The Dark Side of Ralph Nader, 44

Darwin, Charles, 67-68

- comment on Francis Galton's studies, 70-71
- The Descent of Man, 120
- natural selection, 67-68, 79-80
- Origin of Species, 67-68, 84
- origins of living things, 66-69
- social and moral instincts, 119-120, 124

Darwin, Erasmus, 69

DeFries, John, 75-76

dendrites, 89-90

dependent personality pattern

- definition of, 35, 59
- example of, 51-52
- I'm vulnerable opinion, 54, 56, 161

The Descent of Man, 120

de Waal, Frans, 121

disgust as moral emotion, 122-123

DNA

- building blocks of, 74-79
- epigenetic changes of, 100-102

dopamine, 78-79, 90, 98

Dowd, Maureen, 27

DRD4 gene, 79

Dreams from My Father, 166

DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual), American Psychiatric Association, 34-35
Dunedin, New Zealand, study of children, 97-99

E

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 170
elevation as moral emotion,

122-123

Elkind, Peter, 152

Ellis, Joseph, 131

environment

brain development

effect on gene expression,

100-102

versus genes, 97-100

influence of, 92-94

factors in diversity, 79-83

epigenetic modifications of

DNA, 101-102

Erikson, Erik

identity, development of,

87-88, 140-141

life stories

challenges formulating

stories, 148-149

inventive interpretations,

148

ethics

of autonomy, 126-129

of community, 126-127

of divinity, 126-128

Extraversion (E)

definition of, 17

examples

Barack Obama, 26-27, 161

Ben Franklin, 115

Bill Clinton, 25-26, 81, 161

facets of, 20, 22

high/low scorers

nouns for, 33

tradeoffs, 81

personality patterns

histrionic, 40-41

schizoid and schizotypal,

37-39

representative words, 16

F

facets of Big Five tendencies,

20-23

Fischer, Bobby, 39

Franklin, Benjamin

The Art of Virtue, 114-115, 130

Autobiography, 148

character

analysis of, 128-133

example of, 111-115

as publicist, 148

fraternal twins, heredity

research, 70-72

Freud, Sigmund, 82

frugality virtue, 112

G

Galton, Francis, heredity

research, 13-14, 69-74

generativity versus

self-absorption life challenge,

148-149

genes/gene expression. *See also*

brain development

DNA and gene variants, 74-77

environment

effect on gene expression,

100-102

versus genes, 97-100

genetic testing, 77-79
 personality traits, 65-66
 regulation of, 75

Gentlemen Prefer Blondes, 41

glucocorticoid receptor (GR)
 gene, 101-102

GnRH (gonadotropin-releasing hormone), 103

Goldberg, Lewis, 15

Goldman, Ron, 46

gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH), 103

Gore, Al, 43

gratitude as moral emotion, 121-123

GR (glucocorticoid receptor)
 gene, 101-102

guanine, 74

H

Haidt, Jonathan, 122

Hare, Robert, 45, 47

heredity factors. *See also*
 genes/gene expression
 Bouchard's study of identical twins, 72-74
 opinions of Darwin and Galton, 67-71

"The History of Twins as a Criterion of the Relative Powers of Nature and Nurture," 70

histrionic personality pattern
 definition of, 35, 59
 example of, 40-41
 I'm special opinion, 54-55, 161

humanity virtue, 125, 131, 134

humility virtue, 113

hypothalamus, 91

I

identical twins, heredity
 research, 70-74

identity
 age of discovery of, 140-141
 life stories, 139-140
Barack Obama example, 164-167
Benjamin Franklin example, 149-153
Bill Clinton example, 164-167
Oprah Winfrey example, 141-147
Steve Jobs example, 149-153
 subset of personality, 140

If I Did It, 46

I Hate You, Don't Leave Me, 52

I'm detached opinion, 54, 56, 161

I'm right opinion, 54-55, 161

I'm special opinion, 54-55, 161

I'm vulnerable opinion, 54-55, 161

industry virtue, 112

integrity versus despair life
 challenge, 148

intimacy versus isolation life
 challenge, 148-149

intuition, 1-2, 7

IPIP (International Personality Item Pool) test, 21

Isaacson, Walter, 129, 131, 148

J

Jobs, Laurene, 153

Jobs, Steve

life stories example, 149-153

"The Trouble with Steve Jobs,"

151-152

Johnson, John A., 21

justice virtue, 113, 125, 131, 134

K

Kagan, Elena, 140

Kagan, Jerome, 95-96

Kissinger, Henry, 91

Klein, Joe, personality trait

assessments

of Barack Obama, 26-28

of Bill Clinton, 7-9, 23-28

Kluckhohn, Clyde, 159

L

life stories and identity, 139-140

age of discovery of identify,

140-141

examples

*Barack Obama, 164-167**Bill Clinton, 164-167**Oprah Winfrey, 141-147**Steve Jobs, 149-153*

subset of personality, 140

Lorenz, Konrad, 92-93

M

Madoff, Bernard, 45-46

MAOA gene, 98-100

McAdams, Dan, 140, 153

McCrae, Robert, 19-20, 36

Meaney, Michael, 100-101

Millon, Theodore, 48

moderation virtue, 113

monoamine oxidase-A enzyme,
98-99

Monroe, Marilyn, 40-41

morality, instincts and

emotions, 119-124

moral evaluations

*of others, 135-136**of self, 136-137*

separation

*of cultural values and**character judgments,*

126-128

*of personality traits and**character, 116-117*

Top Ten personality patterns,

117-119

virtues

of Benjamin Franklin,

112-115

*universal character**strengths, 124-126*

MRI and fMRI imaging of

brain structures, 104

Mundy, Liza, 166

Murray, Henry, 159

myelin/myelination, 91

N

Nader, Ralph, 42-44

Napoleon, 44

narcissistic personality pattern

definition of, 35, 59

examples of, 42-45

I'm special opinion, 54-55, 161

NEO PI-R questionnaire, 19-20
neuroD2 gene, 66

neurons/neurotransmitters,
89-91, 98

Neuroticism (N)

definition of, 18

examples

Barack Obama, 161, 163

Ben Franklin, 115

Bill Clinton, 25-27

facets of, 20, 22-23

heritability of, 72

high/low scorers

nouns for, 33

tradeoffs, 82

personality patterns

avoidant, 49-51

borderline, 52-53

dependent, 51-52

representative words, 16

No Country for Old Men, 47

Noitrix, 37-39

norepinephrine, 98

O

Obama, Barack

The Audacity of Hope, 167

comparison with Bill Clinton,

26-28, 161-167

descriptions

by Joe Klein, 27

by Maureen Dowd, 27

Dreams from My Father, 166

life stories, example, 164-167

obsessive-compulsive

personality pattern, 35

OCEAN, acronym for Big

Five, 15

Odbert, H.S., 10

Openness (O)

definition of, 18

examples

Barack Obama, 26

Ben Franklin, 115

Bill Clinton, 26

facets of, 23

heritability of, 72

high/low scorers

nouns for, 33

tradeoffs, 82

representative words, 16

opinions of self and others,

54-56, 61, 161

order virtue, 112

Origin of Species, 67-68, 84

P

paranoid personality pattern

definition of, 35, 59

examples of, 41-44

I'm right opinion, 54-55, 161

P (significant person)

assessments, 172-173

of Big Five tendencies, 30-31,

171

of genes and personality, 85

of genetic and environmental

influences, 108

of identity, 155-157, 172

IPIP questionnaire, 21

of troublesome patterns,

62, 171

of virtues, 137, 171

personality assessment. *See*

also Big Five tendencies;

personality patterns, Top Ten

character, 2

contradictory ideas, 1

lack of education about, 1-2

patterns of behavior, 2-3

tendencies, 2

personality patterns, Top Ten

antisocial personality pattern

examples of, 45-47

I'm special opinion, 54-55,

161

avoidant personality pattern

example of, 49-51

I'm vulnerable opinion,

54-55, 161

borderline personality pattern

example of, 52-53

I'm vulnerable opinion, 54,

56, 161

colloquial names for, 35

compulsive personality pattern

example of, 47-49

I'm right opinion, 54-55, 161

definitions of, 34-35, 58-60

dependent personality pattern

example of, 51-52

I'm vulnerable opinion, 54,

56, 161

histrionic personality pattern

example of, 40-41

I'm special opinion, 54-55,

161

importance of, 56-57

moral judgments, 117-119

narcissistic personality pattern

examples of, 42-45

I'm special opinion, 54-55,

161

opinions of self and others,
53-56

paranoid personality pattern

examples of, 41-44

I'm right opinion, 54-55, 161

schizoid personality pattern

example of, 38-39

I'm detached opinion, 54,

56, 161

schizotypal personality

pattern

example of, 39

I'm detached opinion, 54,

56, 161

troublesome patterns, 2-3,

60-61

personality traits. *See also* Big

Five tendencies; personality

patterns, Top Ten

character, separation from

traits, 115-119

correlations, positive or

negative, 14-15

dictionary descriptions, 9-11

grouping traits, 13-16

narrowing list, 12-13

phrases instead of adjectives,

19-20

synonyms and antonyms,

12-13

environment effect on, 79-83

factor analysis, 15

genetic testing results, 77-79

gene variants effect on, 74-77

heredity research, 69-74

Peterson, Christopher, 124

promoters, 74-75

Prozac, 77-78

R

resolution virtue, 112

Ritalin, 77, 79

Ross, Diana, 143

S

schizoid personality pattern

definition of, 35, 59

example of, 38-39

I'm detached opinion,

54, 56, 161

schizotypal personality pattern

definition of, 35, 60

example of, 39

I'm detached opinion, 54, 56,

161

Sculley, John, 150, 152

self-directedness as character

component, 125, 134

self-transcendence as character

component, 125-126, 134

Seligman, Martin, 124

serotonin, 78, 90, 98

SERT gene, 78-79

Seven Habits of Highly

Effective People, 129

sex hormones, 103

Shawn, Allen, 50

Shawn, William, 50

Shweder, Richard, 126

silence virtue, 112

Simpson, Nicole, 46-47

Simpson, O.J., 46-47

sincerity virtue, 113

SLC24A5 gene, 68

The Sopranos, 97

"Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish,"

151-153

Steinem, Gloria, 40

A Streetcar Named Desire, 41

synapses/synaptic signaling, 90

T

temperance virtue, 112, 125, 130,

134

13 virtues, Benjamin Franklin,

112-113

Thomas, Alexander, 94

thymine, 74

Top Ten personality patterns.

See also specific patterns

as character flaws, 118-119

colloquial names for, 35

definitions of, 34-35, 58-60

importance of, 56-57

moral judgments, 117-118

opinions of self and others,

53-56, 61

troublesome patterns, 60-61

transcendence virtue, 125, 132,

134

tranquility virtue, 113

Trivers, Robert, 120, 122

"The Trouble with Steve Jobs,"

151-152

twins, heredity research, 70-74

V

virtues/character strengths

Ben Franklin's list, 112-115

universal list, 124-126

W

Webster's New International
Dictionary, 10

The Whole Earth Catalog
motto, 153

Widiger, Thomas, 36

Winfrey, Oprah, 141-147

Winfrey, Vernon, 142-143

wisdom virtue, 125, 132, 134

Wish I Could Be There, 50

Wozniak, Steve, 150

Z

Zuckerberg, Mark, 196-197