

AI statement

I confirm that I have not used any AI tools in the research and creation of this assignment. I confirm that I have not presented any AI-generated materials as my own work. I confirm I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used, which I may be asked to provide in evidence

Discuss how trait theories of personality account for individual differences in behaviour

Trait theories of personality try to explain why individuals differ in the ways they think, feel, and behave. In Psychology, traits are understood as somewhat stable motives for behaviours, thoughts, and emotions that are consistent across time (Allport, 1937). Personality is a set of long-lasting characteristics that influence how people respond to the world around them (McCrae & Costa, 2008). Behaviour is any observable action or response shown by an individual. This includes emotional reactions, social interactions, and decision-making. Trait theorists argue that differences in individuals' personality traits explain why they behave differently even when faced with the same situation (Cattell, 1946). Although trait theory is one of the most widely regarded approaches in personality psychology, its ability to explain behaviour has been the subject of debate (Mischel, 1968). Whilst the approach offers a useful way to measure and predict behavioural propensity, critics argue that it may not fully account for the complexities of human behaviour.

Gordon Allport (1937), considered a founding father, was among the earliest psychologists to develop trait theory. He believed that personality was composed of different traits that influenced how people behaved. Cardinal traits, central traits, and secondary traits were the three categories Allport divided them into. Cardinal traits are the dominant characteristics which strongly shape an individual's identity and behaviour, although it's considered rare. Central traits are more common and are considered general characteristics, such as kindness, honesty, and friendliness. These traits help describe an individual's overall personality. Secondary traits are specific tendencies that appear only in certain situations, such as habits or a

person's preferences (Allport, 1961). An example of this would be someone who only gets anxious when speaking in public. Allport's work was important because it initiated the idea that personality traits can explain reliable patterns in behaviour. However, a limitation of Allport's theory was that it didn't provide a clear scientific method for measuring these traits, making it difficult for researchers to test empirically (McCrae & Costa, 2008).

In response to this issue, psychologists attempted to develop more methodical and measurable approaches to studying personality traits. Raymond Cattell (1965) used a numerical method, factor analysis, to reduce many personality traits into a smaller set of key factors. Through this method, he recognised sixteen personality factors that he believed formed the arrangement of personality. Cattell's work was essential because it adopted a more scientific approach to the theory. He aimed to identify the underlying traits that influence behaviour by analysing patterns in large sets of personality data. However, some researchers criticised Cattell's sixteen-factor model for being difficult to replicate in later studies. Many studies suggested that personality could be explained by a smaller number of broad traits (Digman, 1990), which led to the development of the five-factor model.

Other trait theorists, such as Eysenck (1991), proposed a more biological model of personality, which focused on traits such as extraversion and neuroticism. He emphasised that these traits could be inherited, highlighting the interaction between observed behaviours and biological predispositions. His work provides an alternative to Cattell's sixteen-factor model, demonstrating that personality theory has evolved through multiple approaches. Reducing personality may overlook important variations in individual differences.

The most predominant contemporary trait framework is the five-factor model, also known as the Big Five or OCEAN. This was primarily developed by Paul Costa and Robert McCrae (1992). This remains the most dominant framework today. It suggests that personality can be described using five broad dimensions: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism (John & Srivasta, 1999). Each one represents a continuum along which individuals vary. Openness to experience refers to creativity, imagination and a willingness to try new things. Conscientiousness describes how organised, responsible and self-disciplined an individual is. Extraversion refers to sociability, enthusiasm and assertiveness. Agreeableness relates to empathy, kindness and cooperation. Neuroticism reflects emotional instability and a tendency to experience negative emotions such as anxiety or stress. Differences in these traits help explain many behavioural differences between people, according to trait theorists. Conscientious people may be more organised and responsible, whereas those who score highly in neuroticism may react more intensely to negative events and stress (McCrae & Costa, 2003).

Individuals who score higher in extraversion tend to enjoy social situations, spending time with others and have an outgoing personality. In contrast, those who score lower in extraversion tend to prefer quieter environments and spending time by themselves. People who score highly in conscientiousness tend to be more organised, goal-focused and trustworthy. This enables them to meet deadlines, plan, and follow routine. Together, these examples illustrate how personality traits can influence how people experience different situations. Although traits do not fully determine someone's behaviour, they increase the likelihood that a person may act in a certain way.

One of the major strengths of the trait is the ability to measure personality using reliable psychological mechanisms. Psychometric questionnaires usually assess personality traits by asking individuals to rate statements about their thoughts, feelings, and typical behaviours. A widely used example of this is the NEO personality inventory, developed by Costa and McCrae and measuring not only the Big Five traits but also their smaller facets (Costa & McCrae, 1992). These assessments allow the researchers to collate numerical data, which can then be statistically analysed. Multiple studies have shown that these measures generally exhibit good validity and reliability, indicating they produce coherent results and precisely measure key aspects of personality. This scientific approach has enabled psychologists to study personality more systematically and to understand how traits relate to diverse behaviours (Goldberg, 1990).

Regardless of evidence, trait theories have also been critiqued for placing too much emphasis on internal personality characteristics whilst minimising the importance of situational factors. One of the most influential critiques comes from Walter Mischel. Mischel (1968) argued that behaviour often varies across situations and that personality traits alone cannot consistently predict behaviour. His analysis of personality research suggested correlations between trait theories and behaviour were often marginally lower. This argument sparked the person-situation debate, which focused on whether behaviour is mainly shaped by personality traits or environmental factors.

Although Mischel's analysis is an important limitation of trait theory, later research suggested that the relations between traits and behaviour may be greater than originally suggested. Multiple psychologists argued that traits should be used to predict general patterns of behaviour over time rather than specific actions in

isolated situations. When behaviour is examined across countless situations, stronger relationships between personality traits and behaviour tend to emerge. This led to the interactionist approach, which argues that behaviour is shaped by an interaction between personality traits and situational influences (Roberts & Mroczek, 2008). This perspective shows that traits create tendencies for certain behaviours, but environmental factors influence how and when they occur.

Another analysis of trait theories is that they are mainly descriptive; although they can identify and measure personality differences, they cannot always explain why those traits develop in the first place. Other approaches to personality theories try to address this issue. Psychodynamic theories, pioneered by Freud (1923), highlight the influence of the unconscious mind and childhood experiences, addressing internal dynamics that trait theories do not. Whereas social cognitive theories (Bandura, 1986) focus on beliefs, learning and mental processes. This offers an alternative explanation for individual differences. Trait theories remain useful because they offer insight into personality, reliable ways to measure it, and strong research evidence (McCrae, Costa & Piedmont, 1993).

Cross-cultural research has supported trait theories; studies across numerous countries have found evidence for the Big Five in different cultures (McCrae & Terracciano, 2005). This suggests that these traits may be common across personality. However, culture can show how these traits are shown and valued. Outgoing behaviour may be encouraged in cultures that value independence and self-expression, whilst quieter behaviour may be preferred in cultures that emphasise solidarity. This shows that personality traits work in unison with social and cultural influences to help shape behaviour.

In conclusion, trait theories of personality provide an important framework for understanding individual differences in behaviour. By identifying stable personality traits and measuring them with psychological tools, researchers have shown a direct correlation between personality and many types of behaviour. The development of the Big Five by Costa and McCrae (1992) has improved the scientific study of personality and provided helpful ways to foretell behavioural patterns. However, trait theories do have limitations. Although it can simplify the complexity of human behaviour, it does not fully explain how personality develops or how situations affect behaviour. Incorporating Freud (1923) into the psychodynamic approach and Bandura (1986) into the social cognitive perspective helps bridge the gap. Overall trait theories cannot fully explain why people behave in certain ways, they remain among the most widely useful and well-supported approaches to understanding personality differences.

Reference list:

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. Holt.

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Cattell, R. B. (1946). *Description and measurement of personality*. World Book Company.

Cattell, R. B. (1965). *The scientific analysis of personality*. Penguin.

Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Digman, J. M. (1990). *Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model*. Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417–440.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221>

Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3? Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(8), 773–790.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(91\)90144-z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90144-z)

Freud, S. (1923). *The ego and the id*. Hogarth Press.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). *An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(6), 1216–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>

- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Terracciano, A. (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 547–561. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.547>
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., & Piedmont, R. L. (1993). Folk Concepts, Natural Language, and Psychological Constructs: The California Psychological Inventory and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 61(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00276.x>
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. Wiley.
- Roberts, B. W., & Mroczek, D. (2008). Personality trait change in adulthood. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(1), 31–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00543.x>