

This is the manuscript version of an article that was published in:
Science Magazine 310(5745):pp. 96-100.

Copyright 2005

For access to the published version, see:

<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/reprint/310/5745/96.pdf>

or <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1117199>

National Character Does Not Reflect Mean Personality Trait Levels in 49 Cultures

A. Terracciano,^{1*} A. M. Abdel-Khalek,² N. Ádám,³ L. Adamovová,⁴ C.-k.Ahn,⁵ H.-n. Ahn,⁶ B. M. Alansari,² L. Alcalay,⁷ J. Allik,⁸ A. Angleitner,⁹ A. Avia,¹⁰ L. E. Ayearst,¹¹ C. Barbaranelli,¹² A. Beer,¹³ M. A. Borg-Cunen,¹⁴ D. Bratko,¹⁵ M. Brunner-Sciarra,¹⁶ L. Budzinski,¹⁷ N. Camart,¹⁸ D. Dahourou,¹⁹ F. De Fruyt,²⁰ M. P. de Lima,²¹ G. E. H. del Pilar,²² E. Diener,²³ R. Falzon,¹⁴ K. Fernando,²⁴ E. Ficková,⁴ R. Fischer,²⁵ C. Flores-Mendoza,²⁶ M. A. Ghayur,²⁷ S. Gülgöz,²⁸ B. Hagburg,²⁹ J. Halberstadt,²⁴ M. S. Halim,³⁰ M. Hebíková,³¹ J. Humrichouse,¹³ H. H. Jensen,³² D. D. Jovic,³³ F. H. Jónsson,³⁴ B. Khoury,³⁵ W. Klinkosz,³⁶ G. Knežević,³⁷ M. A. Lauri,¹⁴ N. Leibovich,³⁸ T. A. Martin,³⁹ I. Marušić,¹⁵ K. A. Mastor,⁴⁰ D. Matsumoto,⁴¹ M. McRorie,⁴² B. Meshcheriakov,⁴³ E. L. Mortensen,³² M. Munyae,⁴⁴ J. Nagy,³ K. Nakazato,⁴⁵ F. Nansubuga,⁴⁶ S. Oishi,⁴⁷ A. O. Ojedokun,⁴⁸ F. Ostendorf,⁹ D. L. Paulhus,⁴⁹ S. Pelevin,⁴³ J.-M. Petot,¹⁸ N. Podobnik,⁵⁰ J. L. Porrata,⁵¹ V. S. Pramila,⁵² G. Prentice,⁴² A. Realo,⁸ N. Reátegui,¹⁶ J.-P. Rolland,⁵³ J. Rossier,⁵⁴ W. Ruch,⁵⁵ V. S. Rus,⁵⁶ M. L. Sánchez-Bernardos,¹⁰ V. Schmidt,³⁸ S. Sciculna-Calleja,¹⁴ A. Sekowski,³⁶ J. Shakespeare-Finch,⁵⁷ Y. Shimonaka,⁵⁸ F. Simonetti,⁷ T. Sineshaw,⁵⁹ J. Siuta,⁶⁰ P. B. Smith,⁶¹ P. D. Trapnell,⁶² K. K. Trobst,¹¹ L. Wang,⁶³ M. Yik,⁶⁴ A. Zupani,⁶⁵ R. R. McCrae^{1*}

¹National Institute on Aging, NIH, DHHS, Gerontology Research Center, 5600 Nathan Shock Drive, Baltimore, MD 21224. ²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Kuwait, P.O. Box 68168, 71962, Kaifan, Kuwait. ³Faculty of Education and Psychology, Lóránd Eötvös University, 1075 Budapest, Kazinczy u. 23-25, Hungary. ⁴Institute of Experimental Psychology, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dubravska cesta 9, Bratislava, Slovak Republic, 813 64. ⁵Department of Education, Pusan National University, 30 Jangjeon-dong, Geumjeong-gu, Busan 609-735, Republic of Korea. ⁶Department of Psychology, Pusan National University, 30 Jangjeon-dong, Geumjeong-gu, Busan 609-735, Republic of Korea. ⁷Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago, Chile. ⁸Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tiigi 78, Tartu, Estonia, 50410. ⁹University of Bielefeld, Department of Psychology, P.O. Box 100131, Bielefeld, Germany, D-33501. ¹⁰Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain. ¹¹Department of Psychology, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, ON, Canada, M3J 1P3. ¹²Department of Psychology, University of Rome "La Sapienza," Via Dei Marsi 78, 00185 Rome, Italy. ¹³Department of Psychology, University of Iowa, E11 Seashore Hall, Iowa City, IA 52242-1407. ¹⁴Department of Psychology, University of Malta, Msida MSD 06 Malta. ¹⁵Odsjek za Psihologiju, Filozofski Fakultet u Zagrebu, I. Lucica 3, Zagreb, Croatia, 10000. ¹⁶Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Av. Armendáriz 497 Miraflores, Lima, Perú. ¹⁷Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC, 3010, Australia. ¹⁸Laboratoire de Psychologie Clinique des Faits Culturels, Université de Paris-X, 200, Avenue de la République, Nanterre, France, 92001. ¹⁹Department of Psychology, University of Ouagadougou, 03 B.P. 7021 Ouagadougou 03, Burkina Faso. ²⁰Department of Psychology, H. Dunantlaan, 2, Ghent, Belgium, B-9000. ²¹Faculdade de Psicologia, Ciências da Educação,

Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. ²²Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, 1101, Philippines. ²³Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 603 E. Daniel St., Champaign, IL, US, 61820. ²⁴Department of Psychology, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin, New Zealand. ²⁵School of Psychology, PO Box 600, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand. ²⁶U Federal de Minas Gerais, Dept de Psicologia, Sala 4042, Av. Antonio Carlos 6627, Belo Horizonte, Brazil. ²⁷Al Akhawayn University, Ifrane, Morocco; now at Department of Psychology, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Dr., San Diego, CA 92182-4611. ²⁸KoH University, Sariyer 80910, Istanbul, Turkey. ²⁹Unit of Gerontology and Care for the Elderly, Lund University, Box 187, S-222 20 Lund, Sweden. ³⁰Faculty of Psychology, Atma Jaya Indonesia Catholic University, Jl. Jenderal Sudirman kav-51, Jakarta Selatan-12930, Indonesia. ³¹Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Vevří 97, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. ³²Department of Health Psychology, Institute of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Blegdamsvej 3, Copenhagen N, Denmark, DK-2200. ³³Institute for Psychiatry, Pasterova 2, Belgrade, Yugoslavia. ³⁴University of Iceland, Faculty of Social Science, Oddi, Sturlugata, 101 Reykjavík, Iceland. ³⁵Department of Psychiatry, American University of Beirut Medical Center, P.O.Box 11-0236, Riad El-Solh, Beirut 1107 2020 Lebanon. ³⁶Catholic University of Lublin, Department of Psychology, A1. Raclawickie 14, Lublin 20-950 Poland. ³⁷Department of Psychology, University of Belgrade, Cika Ljubina 18-20, 11000 Belgrade, Yugoslavia. ³⁸Faculty of Psychology, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina. ³⁹Department of Psychology, Susquehanna University, 514 University Avenue, Selinsgrove, PA 17870. ⁴⁰Center for General Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. ⁴¹Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132. ⁴²School of Psychology, Queen's University

Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, UK. ⁴³Department of Psychology, International University "Dubna," 19, Universitetskaya str., Dubna, Moscow area, Russia, 141980. ⁴⁴Center for Continuing Education, University of Botswana, Private Bag UB 0022, Gaborone, Botswana. ⁴⁵Department of Psychology, Iwate Prefectural University, 152-52 Sugo, Takizawa, Iwate, 020-0193 Japan. ⁴⁶Department of Organizational Psychology, Makerere University, P.O. Box 7062, Kampala, Uganda. ⁴⁷Department of Psychology, University of Virginia, P. O. Box 400400, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4400. ⁴⁸Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. ⁴⁹Department of Psychology, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada V6T 1Z4. ⁵⁰Psychiatric Hospital of Idrija, Pot Sv. Antona 49 Idrija, 5280 Slovenia. ⁵¹Escuela Graduada de Administracion Publica, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico. ⁵²Department of Psychology, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam 530 003, Andhra Pradesh, India. ⁵³Universit9 Paris 10, STAPS Dept, 200 Avenue de la R9publique, Nanterre, France, 92001. ⁵⁴Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, BFSH 2 Dorigny, Lausanne, Switzerland, CH-1015. ⁵⁵Psychologisches Institut, Zürichbergstrasse 43, 8044 Zürich, Switzerland. ⁵⁶Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. ⁵⁷School of Psychology & Counselling, Queensland University of Technology; now at School of Psychology, University of Tasmania, Locked Bag 1342, Launceston, TAS, 7250 Australia. ⁵⁸Department of Psychology, Bunkyo Gakuin University, 1196, Kamekubo, Oi-machi, Iruma-gun, Saitama, 356-8533 Japan. ⁵⁹Department of Psychology, Ramapo College of New Jersey, 505 Ramapo Valley Road, Mahwah, NJ 07430. ⁶⁰Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland. ⁶¹Department of Psychology, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK. ⁶²Department of Psychology, The University of Winnipeg, 515 Portage Ave, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 2E9. ⁶³Department of Psychology, Peking University, Beijing, People's Republic of China. ⁶⁴Division

of Social Science, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong. ⁶⁵Ministry for Health, Štefanova ulica 5, 1000 Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: terraccianoa@grc.nia.nih.gov;
mccraej@grc.nia.nih.gov

Abstract

Most people hold beliefs about personality characteristics typical of members of their own and others' cultures. These perceptions of national character may be generalizations from personal experience, stereotypes with a "kernel of truth," or inaccurate stereotypes. We obtained national character ratings ($N = 3,989$) from 49 cultures and compared them to the average personality scores of culture members assessed by observer ratings and self-reports. National character ratings appeared to be reliable, but did not converge with assessed traits ($Mdn r = .04$). Perceptions of national character thus appear to be unfounded stereotypes that may serve the function of maintaining a national identity.

Beliefs about distinctive personality characteristics common to members of a culture are referred to as national character (1) or national stereotypes (2-4). National stereotypes include beliefs about social, physical, and mental characteristics, but the present article focuses on personality traits. Several factors are thought to influence these beliefs. They may be generalizations based on observations of the personality traits of individual culture members. They may be inferences based on the national ethos, as revealed in socio-economic conditions, history, customs, myths, legends, and values. They may be shaped by comparisons or contrasts with geographically close or competing cultures. Stereotypes are oversimplified judgments, but if they have some “kernel of truth,” (5) national character should reflect the average emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles of members of the culture.

There have been surprisingly few attempts to examine the accuracy of national stereotypes (3, 5-7), perhaps because researchers lacked appropriate criteria. However, recent advances in personality psychology and cross-cultural research make it possible to compare perceived national character to aggregate personality data (that is, the means of a sample of assessments of individuals) across a wide range of cultures.

Personality Traits and Aggregate Personality Profiles

National character may be a social construction, but personality traits are rooted in biology. Most personality psychologists today agree that the dimensions of the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality—Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness—account for the covariation of most personality traits (8), and behavioral genetics studies (9) have shown that traits from all five factors are strongly heritable. As products (in part) of the human genome, traits are universal: Cross-cultural research suggests that the structure and development of personality traits is very

similar in nations as dissimilar as India, Argentina, and Burkina Faso (10). In every culture examined, the five factors are hierarchically related to lower-order traits or facets. For example, the Extraversion factor in the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) (11) is defined by Warmth, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity, Excitement Seeking, and Positive Emotions facets.

Personality traits can be assessed with standardized instruments such as the NEO-PI-R, using either self-reports or observer ratings from knowledgeable informants. The reliability and validity of individual assessments made with the NEO-PI-R are well established (10, 11). Recent cross-cultural data also indicate that aggregate (or mean) NEO-PI-R scores can be validly used to describe cultures as a whole. In a study of self-report data from 36 cultures, culture-level scores were generalizable across age groups and gender, and aggregate scores showed meaningful patterns of convergent and discriminant validity with other culture-level variables such as Individualism-Collectivism (12). Geographically and historically related cultures (such as Germany and Austria or the United States and Canada) showed similar personality profiles (13). Most of these findings were replicated in a subsequent study using observer ratings from 51 cultures (10, 14), and aggregate self-reports were significantly correlated with aggregate observer ratings for most of the 30 NEO-PI-R facets. Assessed aggregate personality scores from these two studies can thus be used in a multimethod evaluation of the accuracy of perceptions of national character.

Accuracy of Stereotypes

There is a substantial literature on the evaluation of the accuracy of stereotypes (3), showing that they may or may not reflect reality. For example, gender stereotypes depicting women as warm and men as assertive are widely held around the world (15). Cross-cultural

studies using both self-reports and observer ratings have shown that women in fact score higher on measures of Warmth, whereas men score higher on measures of Assertiveness (10, 16). Assessed gender differences are small, but are largely consistent with gender stereotypes (17, 18), so those views appear to have a basis in the characteristics of individuals.

The available literature provides less support for the accuracy of beliefs about national character. The perceptions of a panel of experts in cross-cultural psychology did not match beyond chance assessed characteristics in a sample of 26 cultures (19). Church and Katigbak (20) identified raters who had lived in both the United States and the Philippines and asked them to compare the typical American with the typical Filipino on traits that paralleled the 30 NEO-PI-R facets. There was considerable consensus among the judges, but their judgments did not correspond to differences observed when mean American self-reports were compared to mean Filipino self-reports. Another study using the NEO-PI-R found no support for popular stereotypes of Northern and Southern Italians (21).

Here we examine whether national character, as described by culture members themselves (the in-group), are consistent with aggregate personality data. Aggregate scores from self-report and observer ratings on the NEO-PI-R provide the criteria, but measurement of perceived national character requires a new instrument.

Measuring National Character

We designed a short questionnaire, the National Character Survey (NCS), to describe the typical member of a culture (22). The NCS consists of 30 bipolar scales with two or three adjectives or phrases at each pole of the scale (see Appendix S1, on-line). For example, the first item asks how likely it is that the typical member of a culture is *anxious, nervous, worrying* vs. *at ease, calm, relaxed*. Each 5-point scale taps one of the 30 facets assessed by the NEO-PI-R,

with six items for each of the five major dimensions of personality traits. Internal consistency and factor analysis of the NCS items (supporting online material) indicate that the scales have acceptable psychometric properties and successfully define the dimensions of the FFM. To the extent that the FFM is a comprehensive model of personality, the NCS should capture the essential features of national character.

Data were gathered from 49 cultures or subcultures from six continents, using translations into 27 languages from Indo-European, Hamito-Semitic, Sino-Tibetan, Uralic, Malayo-Polynesian, and Altaic families. Most cultures corresponded to nations; however, where subcultures could be identified on the basis of history (e.g., England vs. N. Ireland) or language (e.g., French- vs. German-speaking Switzerland), they were treated as separate samples. In each sample, we asked college students to complete the NCS to describe the typical member of their culture or subculture, and then, as a common basis of comparison, the typical American.

Analyses of the NCS data in the full sample ($N = 3,989$) and in selected subsamples supported the reliability, generalizability, and validity of the NCS as a measure of perceived national character (supporting online text). Interjudge reliability between single raters showed there is only modest agreement between individual judgments of national character, with coefficients ranging from .09 to .30 ($Mdn = .17$). This is roughly half the size of typical agreement between two judges on a single person they both know well (23). However, by aggregating the judgments of an average of 81 raters per culture, highly reliable means were obtained, with reliability coefficients ranging from .96 to .97 for the five factors, and from .89 to .97 ($Mdn = .94$) for the 30 facets. These aggregate values correspond to the shared portion of individuals' perceptions. Men and women provided essentially the same profile of the typical member of their culture: When mean scores for female subsamples were correlated with mean

scores for male subsamples matched on culture, correlations for the five factors ranged from .80 to .90 ($N = 49$; all $ps < .001$).

Additional analyses comparing NCS profiles across groups used T -scores ($M = 50$, $SD = 10$) based on the grand means and standard deviations across all raters and samples for the 30 NCS items. Profile agreement is calculated as the intraclass correlation (ICC) across the 30 facets using the double-entry method (24). Intraclass correlations are similar to Pearson correlations, but are sensitive to both the shapes of the profiles and differences in elevation, and are thus an appropriate metric for assessing profile similarity. With 30 profile elements, ICCs above .57 are significant at $p < .001$.

Several comparisons suggested that NCS means were robust. In Ethiopia and Italy, samples of adults were used as raters in addition to college students and yielded similar profiles (ICCs = .62 and .90, respectively). In some cultures student data from multiple sites were available, and intraclass correlations between these different sites ranged from .76 to .94 (25). This is illustrated by the dotted lines in Figure 1 (26).

Figure 1 about here

Mean NCS scores for the 49 cultures are available on-line, Table S1; the highest and lowest scoring cultures for each factor are listed in Table 1. It is perhaps not surprising that Australians see themselves as Extraverts, German Swiss believe they are typically high in Conscientiousness, and Canadians describe themselves as Agreeable. But many of the other entries are nations with which most readers are not familiar, and it is difficult to judge the plausibility of these ratings. In any case, individual judgments of national character—including

the reader's—have low reliability. The data suggest that aggregate values accurately reflect the way in-group members perceive the personality of the typical member of their culture.

Table 1 about here

Comparing National Character and Aggregate Personality Traits

The primary question this study was designed to address is whether these in-group perceptions of national character accurately reflect aggregate judgments of individual personality traits. A first examination of the data shows one respect in which they are clearly different: There is a much greater range of variation across cultures in perceived traits than in assessed traits. For example, the typical German-speaking Swiss is thought to score 28 *T*-score points higher on Conscientiousness than the typical Indonesian, but the largest difference on observer-rated Conscientiousness between any two cultures was only 8 *T*-score points. Thus, if national stereotypes are accurate at all, they clearly exaggerate real differences.

We first examined agreement of trait profiles within cultures, correlating NCS facet scores with assessed mean facet values from NEO-PI-R observer ratings ($N = 11,479$) in 47 cultures (10) and self-reports ($N = 25,732$) in 30 cultures (12, 22). ICCs between NCS and the NEO-PI-R observer rating profiles ranged from $-.57$ for England to $.40$ for Poland ($Mdn = .00$), and there was a significant positive correlation in only four cultures (New Zealand, Australia, Poland, and Lebanon). Examples of these findings are shown in Figure 1, in which the solid lines, representing mean observer rated NEO-PI-R profiles, deviate markedly from the perceptions of national character, especially with regard to Agreeableness facets. ICCs between NCS and mean NEO-PI-R self-report profiles ranged from $-.46$ for Russia to $.46$ for Poland

($Mdn = -.02$), and only Poland and Japan showed significant positive correlations (see Table S1, on-line). Only for Poland were the observer rating findings replicated. Overall, there is little support for the view that perceptions of national character profiles are accurate in any culture.

However, it is possible that agreement exists for some factors. To determine the degree of agreement for each trait, NCS domain and facets scores were correlated with NEO-PI-R observer rating and self-report across 47 and 30 cultures, respectively. For the five factors, correlations with observer ratings ranged from $-.23$ to $.13$, and those with self-reports ranged from $-.34$ to $.30$ (Table S2, on-line), indicating that there is no relation between aggregate NEO-PI-R data and the NCS on any of the five major dimensions. (This finding is illustrated in Table 1, where cultures scoring high versus low on the five NCS factors do not differ systematically on mean NEO-PI-R T -scores.) There are eleven significant correlations at the facet level, five of which are negative. The median of the 70 correlations was $.04$. The only replicated effect is a significant negative correlation with Openness to Feelings: In cultures where people have a sensitive and rich emotional life, they perceive that their typical compatriot is emotionally impoverished. These analyses, too, provide little reason to trust national stereotypes (27).

Discussion

Comparisons across cultures are always challenging, and several factors may have limited the association between NCS and NEO-PI-R profiles, including problems in translation, response biases such as acquiescence (a yea-saying tendency)(29), and the unfamiliarity of respondents in some cultures with the use of rating scales (10). Comparisons would have been more direct if the full NEO-PI-R had been used to assess national character. Yet the mean NCS scores were reliable and generalizable across sites and types of rater and showed the hypothesized factor structure. Future studies might use more representative raters, although

student and adult samples gave similar results when both were available.

In the case of gender differences, widely held stereotypes are consistent with—although they may exaggerate—assessed personality differences between men and women (16-18). That kernel-of-truth hypothesis does not appear to apply to national character. Correspondence between perceived national character traits and the average levels of traits of individual members of each culture was found neither within nor across cultures. Perceptions of national character are not generalizations about personality traits based on accumulated observations of the people with whom one lives; instead, they appear to be social constructions that may serve different functions altogether. Correlations of NCS scores with culture-level variables might be informative about these functions. Whatever their origins, stereotypes may be perpetuated by information processing biases in attention/perception, encoding, and integration of information (2, 30). They become cultural phenomena, transmitted through media, hearsay, education, history, and jokes.

But national character also has a much darker side. When stereotypes of national or ethnic groups are unfavorable they can lead to prejudice, discrimination, or persecution, of which history and the world today are full of tragic examples. The classic analysis of stereotypes depicted them as the product of authoritarian (31) or prejudiced personalities (32); more recent approaches have considered them as the result of general cognitive processes (2). Though social scientists have long been skeptical about the accuracy of national stereotypes, the present study offers the best evidence to date that in-group perceptions of national character may be informative about the culture, but they are not descriptive of the people themselves.

References

1. D. Peabody, *National characteristics* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985).
2. C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, M. Hewstone, *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (The Guilford Press, New York, 1996).
3. Y. T. Lee, L. Jussim, C. McCauley, *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1995).
4. S. Madon *et al.*, *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **27**, 996 (2001).
5. J. C. Brigham, *Psychol. Bull.* **76**, 15 (1971).
6. C. McCauley, C. L. Stitt, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **36**, 929 (1978).
7. C. M. Judd, B. Park, *Psychol. Rev.* **100**, 109 (1993).
8. J. M. Digman, *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **41**, 417 (1990).
9. T. J. Bouchard, *Science* **264**, 1700 (1994).
10. R. R. McCrae *et al.*, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **88**, 547 (2005).
11. P. T. Costa, Jr., R. R. McCrae, *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual* (Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL, 1992).
12. R. R. McCrae, in *The Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Cultures* R. R. McCrae, J. Allik, Eds. (Kluwer Academic, New York, 2002), pp. 105-125.
13. J. Allik, R. R. McCrae, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* **35**, 13 (2004).
14. R. R. McCrae *et al.*, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* (in press).
15. J. E. Williams, D. E. Best, *Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty nation study* (Sage, Newbury Park, CA, 1982).
16. P. T. Costa, Jr., A. Terracciano, R. R. McCrae, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **81**, 322 (2001).

17. C. L. Martin, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **52**, 489 (1987).
18. J. K. Swim, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **66**, 21 (1994).
19. R. R. McCrae, *J. Pers.* **69**, 819 (2001).
20. A. T. Church, M. S. Katigbak, in *The Five-Factor Model of personality across cultures* R. R. McCrae, J. Allik, Eds. (Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 2002), pp. 129-154.
21. A. Terracciano, R. R. McCrae, in *113th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*. (Washington, DC, 2005).
22. Materials and methods are available as supporting material on Science Online
23. R. R. McCrae *et al.*, *Journal of Research in Personality* **38**, 179 (2004).
24. D. Griffin, R. Gonzalez, *Psychol. Bull.* **118**, 430 (1995).
25. By contrast, distinct cultures within countries showed different profiles. In the UK, the profiles of England and Northern Ireland showed no resemblance ($ICC = -.01$). Similarly, in the PRC, the profiles of China and Hong Kong showed no resemblance ($ICC = -.25$). There is some resemblance between Czech and Slovakian ($ICC = .43, p < .05$), and Serbian and Croatian ($ICC = .43, p < .05$) profiles; the separation of those nations is relatively recent.
26. Additionally, we compared NCS scores from the Philippines to ratings made by bicultural raters in an earlier study (20). Because Church and Katigbak used comparative judgments, we created new NCS scores by subtracting Filipino ratings of the typical American from Filipino ratings of the typical Filipino. The correlation of these 30 difference scores with the Church and Katigbak ratings was $.76, p < .001$.
27. Different standards of evaluation across cultures might have affected the results—that is,

raters from some cultures may have been more generous or critical in their ratings than raters from other cultures, distorting the comparison across cultures. On the assumption that such biases would affect ratings both of one's own compatriots and of Americans, we calculated difference scores by subtracting each judge's rating of the typical American from his or her rating of the typical compatriot for each NCS item. Assuming that cultures agree on the typical American, this procedure in effect subtracts the bias plus a constant, and leaves a potentially better estimate of national character. We standardized the differences as *T*-scores, using difference score normative values from the worldwide sample, excluding the US. The difference scores were highly correlated with NCS scores ($r_s = .65$ to $.91$, $p < .001$), and provided essentially the same results. ICCs between difference scores and NEO-PI-R observer ratings ranged from $-.44$ for England to $.48$ for Lebanon ($Mdn = .03$). ICCs between differences scores and NEO-PI-R self-reports ranged from $-.47$ for Russia to $.53$ for Poland ($Mdn = .01$). For the five factors, correlations with observer ratings across cultures ranged from $.08$ to $.23$, and those with self-reports ranged from $-.37$ to $.23$. These results suggest that the lack of correspondence between NEO-PI-R and NCS profiles is not simply due to different standards of evaluation in different cultures. A different issue concerns the reference-group effect (28), according to which self-reports and observer ratings of individuals are implicitly made by reference to the distribution of scores in the rater's culture. Such an effect would tend to make aggregate personality scores uniform for all cultures, and the failure to find correlations with NCS factors would be due to a lack of variation in aggregate NEO-PI-R means. But NEO-PI-R means in fact vary systematically across cultures and show strong correlations across methods and with other culture-level variables (12, 14). Thus, the

reference-group effect cannot explain the failure to find correlations with NCS scales.

28. S. J. Heine, D. R. Lehman, K. P. Peng, J. Greenholtz, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **82**, 903 (2002)
29. F. van de Vijver, K. Leung, *J. Pers.* **69**, 1007 (2001).
30. D. L. Hamilton, T. L. Rose, *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **39**, 832 (1980).
31. T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, R. N. Sanford, *The authoritarian personality* (Norton. (Original work published 1950), New York, 1969).
32. F. H. Allport, *The nature of prejudice* (Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1954).
33. Robert R. McCrae receives royalties from the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. This research was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National Institute on Aging. Czech participation was supported by Grant 406/01/1507 from the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic and is related to research plan AV AV0Z0250504 of the Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. S. Gulgöz's participation was supported by the Turkish Academy of Sciences. Burkinabè and French Swiss participation was supported by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation to J. Rossier. The data collection in Hong Kong was supported by RGC Direct Allocation Grants (DAG02/03.HSS14 and DAG03/04.HSS14) awarded to M. Yik. Data collection in Malaysia was supported by UKM Fundamental Research Grant 11JD/015/2003 awarded to Khairul A. Mastor. Portions of these data were presented at 113th Convention of the American Psychological Association, August, 2005, Washington DC. For helpful comments on the manuscript we thank Yip H. Poortinga; for their assistance on this project we thank F. Abal, L. de Almeida, S. Baumann, H. Biggs, D. Bion, A. Butkovič, C.Y. Carrasquillo, H. W. Carvalho, S. Catty, C.-S. Chan, A. Curbelo, P. Duffill, L.

Etcheverry, L. Firpo, J. Gonzalez, A. Gramberg, H. Harrow, H. Imuta, R. Ismail, R.

Kamis, S. Kannan N. Messoulam, F. Molina, M. Montarroyos Calegaro, S. Mosquera, J.

C. Munene, V. Najzrova, C. Nathanson, D. Padilla, C. N. Scollon, S. B. Sigurdardottir, A.

da Silva Bez, M. Takayama, T. W. Teasdale, L. N. Van Heugten, F. Vera, and J. Villamil.

Supporting Online Material

Materials and Methods

References

Tables S1, S2

Appendix S1

Table 1

Cultures Scoring Highest and Lowest on Five National Character Survey (NCS) Factors, with
Observer-Rated Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) Factor Mean *T*-Scores

Highest NCS Scores		Lowest NCS Scores	
Culture	NEO-PI-R <i>T</i> -Score	Culture	NEO-PI-R <i>T</i> -Score
<i>Neuroticism</i>			
Indonesia	50.0	The Philippines	48.3
Nigeria	47.8	Canada	49.5
Turkey	51.4	New Zealand	47.9
Poland	50.7	Australia	48.6
Japan	50.7	Burkina Faso	53.1
<i>Extraversion</i>			
Puerto Rico	51.6	Slovenia	49.5
Australia	53.8	Indonesia	45.4
Spain	50.4	French Switzerland	51.0
New Zealand	52.4	Japan	49.4
Serbia	49.3	Estonia	52.1
<i>Openness</i>			
Russia	49.7	P. R. China	50.1
India	48.8	Estonia	46.8
Nigeria	49.1	Chile	51.8
Kuwait	47.6	Turkey	48.2

Deleted: ing Cultures

Puerto Rico	49.7	Japan	51.2
-------------	------	-------	------

Agreeableness

Burkina Faso	51.3	Czech Republic	54.2
--------------	------	----------------	------

India	51.7	Lebanon	46.4
-------	------	---------	------

Canada	49.9	United States	49.1
--------	------	---------------	------

Botswana	48.0	Argentina	50.6
----------	------	-----------	------

Russia	50.3	Hong Kong	46.9
--------	------	-----------	------

Conscientiousness

German Switzerland	53.5	Spain	51.3
--------------------	------	-------	------

Sweden	45.7 ^a	Turkey	51.4
--------	-------------------	--------	------

Germany	52.3	Croatia	50.3
---------	------	---------	------

Burkina Faso	49.7	Chile	52.2
--------------	------	-------	------

Estonia	50.0	Indonesia	49.6
---------	------	-----------	------

<i>Mdn</i>	50.0		49.6
------------	------	--	------

^aObserver rating data were unavailable for Sweden; self-report data are shown (*I2*).

Figure 1.

T-scores for NCS and NEO-PI-R factor and facet scales. On the left the scores for the five factors are plotted; toward the right are the 30 facets, grouped by the factor they define. Dotted lines show the NCS profile of the typical Canadian (top panel) and American (bottom panel) as perceived by students from three Canadian and four American sites, respectively. High profile similarity can be observed among the Canadian sites (ICCs = .89 to .92) and among the American sites (ICCs = .76 to .89), suggesting consensus on national character. Solid lines show mean observer rated NEO-PI-R profiles. In both Canada (ICC = -.03) and the USA (ICC = .23), in-group perceptions of national character across all sites do not reflect aggregate assessments of individual personality traits. The distinction between national character and mean trait levels can also be seen by comparing top and bottom panels: The NEO-PI-R profiles of the USA and Canada are similar (ICC = .66), whereas there is no agreement between their national character ratings (ICC = -.53). N = Neuroticism. E = Extraversion. O = Openness to Experience. A = Agreeableness. C = Conscientiousness.

Supporting online material

Materials and Methods

Participants

Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and, as anonymous survey research, the project was ruled exempt from IRB review. Across cultures, a total of 4,170 individuals completed the NCS. Using exclusion criteria described below, 181 (4.3%) surveys were excluded, leaving 3,989 valid assessments. Sample sizes for each culture ranged from 39 to 351 (see Table S1). The proportion of male respondents was higher in less affluent and lower among European countries. With the exception of Sweden, the mean ages are within the range of college student samples.

In most cultures participants were students, but in a few cases data from adults were also collected. In Sweden and Hungary the samples were mixed. In Ethiopia a non-student sample was recruited in addition to the student sample. In Italy one student sample and two adult samples were recruited. In Brazil ($n = 3$), Canada ($n = 3$), New Zealand ($n = 2$), and the United States ($n = 4$) we collected samples from multiple sites.

Aggregated NEO-PI-R assessments based on observer rating data were obtained from 51 cultures (1), 47 of which overlap with the cultures assessed using the NCS. Self-report data from 36 cultures (2) were supplemented by data provided by J. Rossier from Burkina Faso and French-speaking Switzerland, and by J. Siuta from Poland; 30 of these 39 cultures were also assessed using the NCS.

National Character Survey

The NCS consisted of 30 items (Appendix S1), each corresponding to a facet of the NEO-PI-R. Item order was rotated through the five factors, and to control for acquiescence, half the items for each factor had the positive pole on the right side, whereas the other half had the positive pole on the left side. Scores for the five factors were the sum of the six relevant items after reflecting negatively-keyed items.

The survey was translated from English into 26 other languages. Translations were made by the co-authors into their native languages. Translators were instructed to choose words or phrases that best conveyed the intended construct, using as a reference the description of the 30 facets from the NEO-PI-R *Manual* (3). Translators were instructed to find a bilingual colleague to provide an independent back-translation into English. The first and senior authors independently examined these back-translations, and any items that appeared problematic were reconsidered by the co-authors/translators.

Procedure

In each culture respondents rated a typical member of their own culture or subculture and the typical American. To reduce contrast effect biases, the survey was administered in two steps, and raters were not aware that they would be asked about Americans until the first step was completed. Respondents were tested in groups, and instructions stated that:

We are interested in your opinions on _____s. You are to judge the likelihood of 30 characteristics for the typical _____. At each end of the scale, a description is written. Your task is to place a mark on each scale to describe _____s,

where blanks were filled in with the name of their culture's members.

When everyone in the group was finished, respondents from countries other than the

United States turned to the last page, and the administrator said:

“Now we would like to learn about your opinions of another group, Americans. Have any of you visited or lived in the United States? If so, please check *yes* on at the top of the page. If not, check *no*. Please write “Americans are likely to be” at the top of the page. Then complete the survey just as you did before. When you are finished, please turn the survey in. Please do not discuss this survey with other students who may participate in the study later. Thank you for your help.”

Separate analyses of raters who had ($n = 942$) and had not ($n = 2,368$) been in the United States showed little difference. ICC between American profiles for the two groups was .91.

Protocol Validity

We assessed the validity of individual protocols using rules that paralleled those used for the NEO-PI-R (3). We excluded as invalid questionnaires with more than five missing responses to the 30 items describing the participant's own culture or which showed patterns of random, repetitive responding, specifically, more than ten consecutive *equally likely* responses, or more than five consecutive *very unlikely*, *unlikely*, *likely*, or *very likely* responses. Across samples, seven cases were eliminated because of missing items and 174 were eliminated by the repetitive responses criteria. Ratings of the typical American by other cultures' members were excluded from the analysis involving such ratings when deemed invalid according to the same criteria. Missing items in valid protocols were replaced with the neutral value.

Psychometric Evaluation of the NCS scales

Internal consistency. Analyses of the 3,989 individual responses from the worldwide sample indicated that Cronbach's alpha for the five factor scales were .58, .64, .57, .69, .77 for

Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, respectively. These reliability coefficients are acceptable for six-item scales. None of the items showed negative corrected item/total correlations, but six facets (N4: Self-Consciousness, N5: Impulsiveness, N6: Vulnerability, E3: Assertiveness, O1: Fantasy, and O3: Feelings) showed correlations lower than .30.

Analyses at the culture level using the means of all respondents in each culture ($N = 49$) indicated that Cronbach's alphas for the five factor scales were .77, .84, .75, .83, .93 for Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, respectively. The only facet with a corrected item/total correlation lower than .30 was N5: Impulsiveness.

Factor structure. A principal components analysis was conducted on the 30 items in the entire sample of 3,989 subjects. The first six eigenvalues were 5.5, 3.5, 2.5, 1.3, 1.2, and .9, and parallel analysis (4) indicated that five factors should be retained. The five-factor solution explained 47% of the variance.

The NCS factor structure was rotated toward the American normative NEO-PI-R factor structure to evaluate fit with the target structure (5). As indicated by the total and factor congruence coefficients in Table S2, the NCS factor solution replicates the intended target, according to Haven and ten Berge's .85 criterion (6). This is noteworthy given that only a single item assesses each facet. The departures from the target structure are all consistent with salient secondary loadings in the target structure; for example, N5: Impulsiveness shows a large (and meaningful) negative secondary loading on the Conscientiousness factor in the target matrix.

Interjudge reliability. Intraclass correlation coefficients (7) for the five factors and the 30 facets are reported in Table S2. Intraclass correlations provide estimates of the reliability of single raters [$ICC(1,1) = \frac{BMS - WMS}{BMS + (k-1)WMS}$] and of the culture-average ratings

[$ICC(1,k) = (BMS - WMS)/BMS$], where k is the mean number of raters per culture, BMS is the between-subject mean square, and WMS is the within-subject mean square from an ANOVA with cultures as the independent variable.

References

1. R. R. McCrae *et al.*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (in press).
2. R. R. McCrae, in *The Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Cultures* R. R. McCrae, J. Allik, Eds. (Kluwer Academic, New York, 2002) pp. 105-125.
3. P. T. Costa, Jr., R. R. McCrae, *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual* (Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL, 1992).
4. A. A. Cota, R. Longman, R. Stewart, R. R. Holden, G. C. Fekken, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* **53**, 865 (1993).
5. R. R. McCrae, A. B. Zonderman, P. T. Costa, Jr., M. H. Bond, S. V. Paunonen, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **70**, 552 (1996).
6. S. Haven, J. M. F. ten Berge, Tucker's coefficient of congruence as a measure of factorial invariance: An empirical study *Tech. Report No. 290 EX* (University of Groningen, 1977).
7. P. E. Shrout, J. L. Fleiss, *Psychological Bulletin* **86**, 420 (1979).

Table S1

Sample Description, National Character Survey Factor Scale Means, and Intraclass Correlations with NEO-PI-R Aggregate Observer

Ratings and Self-Reports

Culture	Language	Raters			Mean NCS Factor Scale					ICC _R	ICC _S
		<i>n</i>	% Male	<i>M</i> Age	N	E	O	A	C		
Argentina	Spanish	51	27.5	28.1	56.2	52.6	52.3	42.4	42.0	-.08	—
Australia	English	52	26.9	23.3	40.2	58.1	50.5	54.1	49.7	.38*	—
Belgium	Flemish	82	6.2	20.9	48.9	48.4	48.2	49.9	55.4	-.45*	-.17
Botswana	English	81	30.3	21.4	44.3	48.4	52.4	57.9	50.6	-.11	—
Brazil (3)	Portuguese	149	12.8	23.2	47.5	56.7	55.1	53.0	48.2	.00	—
Burkina Faso	French	50	63.3	25.6	38.6	54.2	51.6	59.9	58.6	-.16	-.40*
Canada (3)	English	238	37.6	21.7	41.1	52.2	55.1	58.6	52.7	-.03	.19
Chile	Spanish	49	34.7	18.7	56.9	43.2	42.6	48.9	38.4	-.33	—
China	Chinese	47	61.7	22.1	43.1	41.6	43.5	51.1	51.0	-.02	-.02
Croatia	Croatian	49	8.2	21.1	55.1	47.5	43.9	47.5	40.8	-.16	.11
Czech Republic	Czech	71	26.8	21.8	54.6	44.3	46.2	45.2	49.2	-.16	.20
Denmark	Danish	63	15.9	27.7	46.5	46.6	46.2	47.6	55.5	-.40*	-.01
Estonia	Estonian	48	12.5	22.9	51.0	38.1	43.3	45.3	55.9	-.10	-.08
Ethiopia (2)	English	97	69.1	27.4	50.2	46.2	51.2	55.9	49.1	-.09	—
France	French	65	12.3	24.2	54.6	46.9	51.5	46.9	50.0	.27	.35
Germany	German	86	17.4	23.3	50.9	44.7	43.7	45.8	59.5	-.04	-.18
Hong Kong	Chinese	93	26.1	19.5	55.9	48.0	45.5	42.4	53.0	.29	-.05
Hungary	Hungarian	49	55.1	23.3	57.3	42.0	46.4	46.0	45.9	—	.24
Iceland	Icelandic	192	50.5	25.9	52.7	51.3	54.8	45.7	49.4	-.06	—
India	English	49	51.0	19.2	43.6	55.5	59.5	59.3	55.1	-.06	-.05
Indonesia	Indonesian	64	32.8	19.5	60.6	41.3	44.1	52.6	34.3	.06	.05
Italy (3)	Italian	197	45.2	26.9	51.3	55.2	54.4	50.8	44.0	.05	-.01
Japan	Japanese	50	40.0	24.1	57.5	39.5	40.8	53.5	53.7	.05	.41*
Kuwait	Arabic	66	56.1	20.5	48.9	55.4	56.4	56.5	53.0	-.07	—
Lebanon (2)	English	103	34.7	19.6	51.9	53.4	52.6	44.6	45.2	.39*	—

Malaysia	Malay	85	22.0	23.3	50.7	47.7	51.9	55.9	48.5	.13	.31
Malta	English	49	28.6	22.2	52.7	53.2	44.3	48.6	48.3	.25	—
Morocco	English	60	51.7	20.9	50.7	48.4	47.5	48.6	44.5	.25	—
New Zealand (2)	English	164	16.5	20.3	41.0	57.2	54.1	53.9	50.5	.36*	—
Nigeria	English	43	44.2	22.7	59.3	56.2	57.3	46.2	49.5	-.12	—
Peru	Spanish	47	25.5	22.2	54.9	51.0	47.9	47.8	43.0	.13	.07
Philippines	Filipino	47	23.4	20.5	43.0	55.3	53.3	53.9	52.3	.14	-.18
Poland	Polish	49	49.0	21.9	58.0	47.2	46.5	45.3	46.8	.40*	.46**
Portugal	Portuguese	46	32.6	21.6	49.6	52.6	47.1	55.5	46.2	-.01	-.19
Puerto Rico	Spanish	39	52.6	24.1	47.1	60.6	56.2	52.7	48.4	.10	—
Russia	Russian	50	38.0	19.6	45.2	56.6	61.6	56.5	45.9	-.35*	-.46**
Serbia	Serbian	69	24.6	21.4	52.0	56.8	47.1	45.5	44.7	.08	-.02
Slovakia	Slovak	47	48.9	20.5	54.9	47.3	45.6	55.6	48.2	.14	—
Slovenia	Slovene	88	14.8	20.8	54.7	41.4	44.2	46.9	55.6	.25	—
South Korea	Korean	53	20.8	21.3	49.4	49.2	49.2	55.7	51.6	-.09	-.21
Spain	Spanish	48	18.8	21.3	45.5	57.8	50.8	50.2	41.9	-.10	-.18
Sweden	Swedish	48	30.4	53.9	44.7	43.7	47.2	54.0	59.8	—	.11
Switzerland	French	68	22.1	22.7	48.9	40.8	43.9	48.3	54.9	-.29	-.29
Switzerland	German	199	19.7	25.8	50.2	42.2	44.5	49.1	62.7	.06	-.18
Turkey	Turkish	59	55.2	20.3	58.2	45.9	42.3	50.6	41.6	.00	-.09
Uganda	English	41	46.3	26.2	50.8	52.2	52.5	47.8	47.7	.28	—
UK: England	English	52	23.1	24.9	50.7	43.9	45.8	46.5	52.9	-.57**	—
UK: N. Ireland	English	46	6.5	20.2	49.8	53.2	47.1	47.4	50.7	.29	—
United States (4)	English	351	31.0	20.2	51.6	52.9	51.0	42.5	48.6	.23	-.01

Note. Multiple sites for a culture are indicated in parentheses. Mean NCS scales are expressed as *T*-scores using across-culture normative values. Dashes indicate missing data. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; NCS = National Character Survey; NEO-PI-R = Revised NEO Personality Inventory; ICC_R = intraclass correlation between mean NCS scores and corresponding aggregate NEO-PI-R observer ratings across 30 facets; ICC_S = intraclass correlation between mean NCS scores and corresponding aggregate NEO-PI-R self-reports across 30 facets. **p* < .05; ***p* < .01 (with Bonferroni correction for 30 profile elements, |*r*|s greater than .56 are significant at *p* < .05).

Table S2.

Descriptive Statistics, Factor Structure of National Character Scales (NCS) after Targeted Rotation, Intraclass Correlations, and NCS/NEO-PI-R Correlations

<i>NCS Scale</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Factor					VC	ICC(1,1)	ICC(1, <i>k</i>)	NEO-PI-R	
			N	E	O	A	C				<i>r</i> _R	<i>r</i> _S
N: Neuroticism	11.49	3.49						.25	.96	.10	-.07	
E: Extraversion	14.49	3.76						.29	.97	.13	-.08	
O: Openness	12.24	3.69						.21	.96	-.23	-.31	
A: Agreeableness	12.93	3.90						.25	.96	.10	.30	
C: Conscientiousness	13.76	4.18						.30	.97	.09	-.34	
N1: Anxiety	2.23	1.07	.67	-.07	-.05	-.31	.16	.85	.24	.96	-.06	.06
N2: Angry Hostility	1.96	1.04	.58	.00	-.12	-.37	-.09	.98 ^b	.20	.95	.10	-.15
N3: Depression	1.89	1.02	.52	-.35	-.09	-.20	-.09	.84	.14	.93	-.02	-.27
N4: Self-Consciousness	1.67	0.99	.39	-.52	-.05	.05	-.09	.78	.12	.91	-.05	-.10
N5: Impulsiveness	2.13	1.06	.17	.36	.13	-.31	-.44	.86 ^a	.23	.96	.34*	-.04
N6: Vulnerability	1.61	1.00	.32	-.37	.09	.07	-.38	.82	.09	.89	.39**	.17
E1: Warmth	2.52	1.12	-.08	.61	.07	.39	-.07	.96 ^b	.25	.96	-.33*	-.24
E2: Gregariousness	2.62	1.04	-.12	.63	.06	-.05	-.07	.98 ^b	.17	.94	.06	-.08
E3: Assertiveness	2.05	1.07	-.27	.18	.22	-.46	.20	.90 ^a	.17	.95	-.11	.12
E4: Activity	2.44	1.00	-.20	.30	.23	-.19	.46	.88 ^a	.11	.91	.10	-.22
E5: Excitement-Seeking	2.46	1.06	-.17	.49	.44	-.21	.01	.82	.24	.96	.47**	.10
E6: Positive Emotions	2.40	1.01	-.26	.60	.21	.19	-.02	.92 ^a	.22	.96	-.09	-.21
O1: Fantasy	1.86	1.12	.23	.30	.32	.06	-.35	.87 ^a	.22	.96	-.18	-.37*
O2: Aesthetics	2.22	1.12	.11	.10	.56	.27	.26	.95 ^b	.12	.92	.19	-.08

O3: Feelings	2.53	1.01	.13	.60	.19	.37	.07	.70	.16	.94	-.37*	-.42*
O4: Actions	1.59	1.11	-.28	.09	.61	-.13	.00	.94 ^b	.14	.93	-.16	-.27
O5: Ideas	2.31	1.08	-.18	.18	.50	.04	.42	.84	.12	.92	.40**	.22
O6: Values	1.73	1.12	-.35	.00	.65	-.03	-.01	.92 ^a	.18	.95	.10	.11
A1: Trust	1.95	1.05	-.17	.13	.14	.45	-.15	.93 ^a	.13	.92	-.01	.09
A2: Straightforwardness	2.11	1.04	-.33	.00	.18	.44	.22	.74	.16	.94	.23	-.07
A3: Altruism	2.34	1.10	-.10	.45	.13	.53	.09	.95 ^b	.19	.95	-.05	.09
A4: Compliance	1.87	1.04	-.07	-.17	.07	.64	-.01	.98 ^b	.16	.94	.34*	.19
A5: Modesty	2.14	1.03	-.07	.00	-.04	.63	.24	.77	.17	.95	-.17	.03
A6: Tender-Mindedness	2.53	0.98	.03	.37	.24	.54	.22	.93 ^a	.12	.92	.15	.40*
C1: Competence	2.57	1.01	-.16	.12	.10	-.01	.61	.95 ^b	.13	.93	.22	.07
C2: Order	2.10	1.05	-.13	-.26	.08	.10	.65	.82	.25	.97	.16	.04
C3: Dutifulness	2.38	0.99	-.18	-.07	.00	.17	.62	.99 ^b	.17	.95	.29	-.16
C4: Achievement Striving	2.30	1.02	-.09	.00	.16	-.14	.69	.96 ^b	.18	.95	-.07	-.45*
C5: Self-Discipline	2.28	1.03	-.21	.07	.01	.06	.65	.98 ^b	.15	.94	.06	.12
C6: Deliberation	2.14	1.03	-.02	-.25	-.08	.25	.57	.95 ^b	.20	.95	.06	-.13
Factor Congruence			.87 ^b	.89 ^b	.85 ^b	.91 ^b	.93 ^b	.89 ^b				

Note: $N = 3,989$. These are principal components targeted to the American normative structure. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O

= Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; VC = Variable congruence coefficient; factor and total congruence

coefficient in the last row; r_R = correlation between mean NCS scores and corresponding aggregate NEO-PI-R observer ratings, $N =$

47; r_S = correlation between mean NCS scores and corresponding aggregate NEO-PI-R self-reports, $N = 30$. ^aCongruence higher than

that of 95% of rotations from random data. ^bCongruence higher than that of 99% of rotations from random data. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

(with Bonferroni correction for 35 NSC scales, none of the correlations is significant).

Appendix S1

The National Character Survey

1. Anxious, nervous, worrying	_____	At ease, calm, relaxed
2. Friendly, warm, affectionate	_____	Cold, aloof, reserved
3. Imaginative, a dreamer	_____	Practical, down-to-earth
4. Trusting, gullible, naive	_____	Suspicious, skeptical, cynical
5. Capable, efficient, competent	_____	Inept, unprepared
6. Even-tempered, easy-going	_____	Irritable, angry, touchy
7. Solitary, shy, avoids crowds	_____	Gregarious, sociable, outgoing
8. Unartistic, uninterested in art	_____	Sensitive to art and beauty
9. Crafty, sly, manipulative	_____	Frank, sincere, straightforward
10. Disorganized, sloppy	_____	Organized, neat, methodical
11. Depressed, sad, pessimistic	_____	Contented, optimistic
12. Assertive, forceful, dominant	_____	Submissive, a follower
13. Emotionally sensitive, passionate	_____	Unfeeling, unempathic
14. Generous, giving, considerate	_____	Selfish, stingy, greedy
15. Dutiful, scrupulous	_____	Unreliable, undependable
16. Poised, comfortable with others	_____	Self-conscious, awkward, timid
17. Slow, lethargic, unenergetic	_____	Active, vigorous, busy
18. Habit-bound, prefers routine	_____	Innovative, prefers variety
19. Aggressive, competitive, stubborn	_____	Compliant, cooperative, docile
20. Lazy, unambitious, aimless	_____	Ambitious, workaholic
21. Impulsive, yielding to temptation	_____	Controlled, self-restrained
22. Adventurous, fun-loving, risk-taking	_____	Avoids excitement, stimulation
23. Intellectually curious, open-minded	_____	Narrow interests, bored by ideas
24. Modest, humble, self-effacing	_____	Arrogant, conceited
25. Disciplined, persistent, strong-willed	_____	Procrastinating, quitting, weak
26. Resilient, copes well with crises	_____	Vulnerable, fragile, helpless
27. Somber, dull, sober	_____	Happy, cheerful, joyous
28. Dogmatic, traditional, conservative	_____	Liberal, free-thinking
29. Ruthless, hard-headed, unsentimental	_____	Sympathetic, humanitarian
30. Spontaneous, careless, thoughtless	_____	Cautious, reflective, careful