Table

Some Details for the Nine Lexical Studies Utilized in Study 1

| Language | Procedure for generation of terms | Instructions | Eigenvalues/proportions of variance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maa | A total of 779 descriptors for human attributes of any kind were extracted from a draft Maa dictionary, including all word-classes; retained were those 203 judged by the consensus of several raters (all native-language speakers) to be the most frequently used terms in the language for describing attributes of persons. | Each participant was asked to first describe a person whom they knew well and thought highly of, and then to select a person they thought less highly of than the first. | Ipsatized peer-ratings for admired targets: 7.5, 6.4, 3.6, 3.3, 2.8, 2.7, 2.4, 2.3, 2.2, and 2.1% of variance in first 10 factors. Ipsatized peer-ratings for less admired targets: 26.7, 5.9, 2.9, 2.3, 2.0, 1.9, 1.9, 1.7, 1.7, and 1.6%. |
| Senoufo (Supyire) | A total of 678 descriptors for human attributes of any kind were extracted from a draft Supyire dictionary, including all word-classes; retained were those 208 judged by the consensus of several raters (all native-language speakers) to be the most frequently used terms in the language for describing attributes of persons. | Each participant was asked to first describe a person whom they knew well and thought highly of, and then to select a person they thought less highly of than the first. | Ipsatized peer-ratings for admired targets: 15.6, 5.3, 4.7, 3.9, 3.6, 3.3, 3.0, 2.9, 2.7, and 2.6% of variance in first 10 factors. Ipsatized peer-ratings for less admired targets: 16.9, 6.3, 4.8, 3.6, 3.5, 3.1, 3.0, 2.8, 2.6, and 2.4%. |
| Chinese | Modified methodology as per Angleitner, Ostendorf, and John (1990) and Saucier et al. (2005). 3,159 personality descriptors were extracted from the Contemporary Chinese Dictionary by three independent native speakers (psychology-student research assistants from different areas of China) instructed to exclude terms that were: (a) applicable to all individuals; (b) referring to geographical origin, nationality, or profession; (c) referring to only a part of the person or appearance; or (d) having personality implications that are both metaphorical and tenuous. 10 student judges from six different | 5-point scale: 1 (this word is very inaccurate for the description of me), 2 (this word is somewhat inaccurate for the description of me), 3 (this word is neither accurate nor inaccurate for the description of me), 4 (this word is somewhat accurate for the description of me), and 5 (this word is very accurate for the description of | For ipsatized self-ratings, the first eight eigenvalues accounted for 16.2%, 6.3%, 4.3%, 2.8%, 2.0%, 1.9%, 1.7%, and 1.4% of variance. Percentages for ipsatized peer ratings were 11.6%, 6.0%, 3.8%, 2.8%, 2.0%, 1.9%, 1.5%, and 1.3%. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | provinces rated the terms for frequency of use for person description on a 5-point scale: 1 (this word is never used for the description of a person) to 5 (this word is extremely often used for the description of a person). 413 terms received an average rating of 4.5 or more were used in the subsequent study. | me). | |
| Polish | 1,839 adjectives were chosen from a concise dictionary as relevant to personality description by two judges. and from lists of trait adjectives. These were categorized as per Angeleiter et al, 1990, and a list of 287 disposition terms were selected for the study. | Told to describe themselves as accurately as possible on a 5 point scale from 1 (not application at all) to 5 (fully applicable) | Eigenvalues for self-ratings, first ten factors: 9.41, 7.98, 4.47, 4.17, 3.23, 2.58, 1.93, 1.85, 1.77, 1.72 For peer-ratings: 8.81, 7.10, 4.89, 3.51, 3.28, 2.55, 2.24, 1.91, 1.89, 1.67 |
| Greek | A modified version of Angleitner et al (1990) methodology. 3,302 potentially personality-relevant adjectives were extracted from the newest edition of the Greek dictionary by judges instructed to extract "all adjectives that they considered personality relevant . . . the term should fit into a sentence such as "How [*adjective*] am I?"; excluding terms as detailed above for Chinese. 2,245 terms were rated as adequately clear in meaning by seven university students and graduates. 400 final words were selected based on clarity ratings by community members, and on frequency of use "for the description of a person" by a new group of students judges. | Told to describe themselves as accurately as possible on a 5 point scale from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate) | Values for ipsatized data not reported; the study published in 2005 concentrated on original rather than ipsatized data, but ipsatized data was used in the Big Two study to ensure comparability with other studies. |
| Filipino | 6,900 adjectives that "can be used to describe a person or his behavior" were extracted from a comprehensive Filipino dictionary | Accuracy of adjective for self-description on an 8 point bipolar scale | Eigenvalues for first nine factors: 37.61, 19.64, 12.05, 8.34, 6.84, 6.69, 6.34, 5.49, 5.32 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (Church et al, 1996). 1,297 were classified by 9 judges as referring to personality or mental ability using Angleiter, et al (1990) criteria. 682 terms were selected as familiar and relevant to traits by undergraduate raters (Church et al., 1997). Lewd, gender specific, disparaging, social effects, and attractiveness terms removed for 502 final. | --extremely inaccurate, quite, somewhat, a little, etc. (X if word is unknown) | (502 variables) |
| Turkish | 2,200 person descriptive adjectives (broadly construed) were selected by five native speakers using three modern abridged Turkish dictionaries (Somer & Goldberg, 1999). Removing most terms describing physical characteristics and appearance, mere evaluations, social attitudes, and special abilities, as well as unusually slangy terms left 1,300 adjectives. The 498 most familiar terms were selected based on ratings of familiarity by undergraduate students. | A seven-step response scale, with instructions to the participants to describe them-selves as accurately as possible. | Proportions of variance for first 10 factors: 10.0, 5.7, 3.2, 3.1, 2.0, 1.6, 1.5, 1.2, 1.1, 1.0 |
| Hungarian | Per Angeleiter et al 1990, 8,738 person descriptive terms, including word classes ex. verbs were extracted using two dictionaries. 3,914 adjectives, minus sex-specific terms were rated by 5 undergraduate judges in terms of familiarity. The 3,204 highly familiar terms were rated in terms of relevance to personality, and the 624 most relevant terms were selected. After administering, terms with extreme means and small SDs were removed, such that PCA was on 561 terms | Ratings of applicability of the term to self on a 4-point scale (1 not applicable to 4 applicable) | 8.03, 6.32, 4.12, 2.81, 1.79, 1.61, 1.41 (Article provides a graphic of the first 20 eigenvalues but numbers only reported for first seven) |
| Korean | Hahn's (1992) list of 785 frequently-used Korean trait terms was developed with (a) 1,020 high | Rate their own personalities on a five-point scale | Eigenvalues for first ten factors: 39.2, 32.7, 27.8, 12.4, 8.1, 7.0, 6.6, 5.5, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| school and university students who provided free descriptions of personality for liked and disliked persons (adjectives pertaining to physical characteristics, temporary states, or pure evaluation were removed); (b) a table of the frequency of occurrence of Korean words in printed media; (c) comparison to three previous lists of Korean personality adjectives; and (d) selection based on relevance for describing personality, as per four raters (author and three graduate students). The 406 most commonly used of these items were selected per ratings of frequency of use on a 1-7 scale by 125 university students. | from 1 (very uncharacteristic) to 5 (very characteristic) | 4.7, 4.6 |

Table

Big One and Big Two Marker Terms (Generated in Study 1)

---

*Big One terms* (+) **Diligent** (6), **Generous, Honest** (5); Careful, Good, Happy, Kind, Patient, Respectful, Responsible, Thoughtful (4); Active, Brave, Conscientious, Consistent, Dependable, Disciplined, Dutiful, Friendly, Gentle, Helpful, Humane, Polite, Shame (having it), Stable (3)

(-) Lazy, Selfish (4); Egocentric, Envious, Gossip(y), Greedy, Sad, Stingy (3)

*Big Two terms*

30 Social Self-Regulation terms:

(+) **Honest, Kind** (7); **Generous, Gentle, Good, Obedient, Respectful** (6); **Diligent, Responsible** (5); Calm, Careful, (Self-)Disciplined, Patient, Polite (4); Benevolent, Conscientious, Courteous, Dutiful, Faithful, Good-Natured, Humane, Industrious, Simple, Thoughtful (3)

(-) **Selfish** (5); Egocentric, Envious, Gossipy, Hot-Headed, Rebellious (3)

29 Dynamism terms:

**Active** (7); **Brave** (6); **Bold, Lively** (5); Daring, Dynamic, Strong (3); Clever, Courageous, Enterprising, Extraverted, Intelligent, Talkative, Vigorous

**Timid** (7); **Weak** (6); **Shy** (5); Cowardly, Fearful, Pessimistic, Sad, Silent (4); Anxious, Depressed, Dull, Introverted, Melancholy, Taciturn, Troubled (3)

---

Note. Based on ipsatized data, these are lists of the most recurrent terms, with number of languages in which each appeared; those found in translations for high-loading terms in five or more languages are in boldface type.

Table

Means, Standard Deviations, and Other Psychometric Characteristics of Adjective-Aggregates

Used in Study 2

| Scale/Aggregate | # items | Mean | SD | MIC | SDIC | Coefficient Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Big Two** | | | | | | |
| Social Self-Regulation | 30 | 5.58 | .49 | .18 | .13 | .83 |
| Social Self-Regulation | 10 | 5.78 | .56 | .26 | .13 | .73 |
| Dynamism | 29 | 5.17 | .83 | .21 | .13 | .89 |
| Dynamism | 7 | 5.01 | .85 | .28 | .10 | .72 |
| **Interpersonal Circumplex (IAS-R) axes** | | | | | | |
| Nurturance | 10 | 5.80 | .61 | .28 | .11 | .77 |
| Dominance | 13 | 4.71 | .85 | .27 | .13 | .81 |
| **Stereotype-Content Model** | | | | | | |
| Warmth/Morality | 4 | 6.02 | .65 | .42 | .06 | .74 |
| Competence | 4 | 5.89 | .67 | .44 | .08 | .74 |
| **Wojciszke et al. Dimensions** | | | | | | |
| Morality/Communion | 5 | 6.02 | .60 | .32 | .15 | .55 |
| Competence/Agency | 5 | 5.83 | .74 | .31 | .14 | .67 |

N=308. The mean is the average response across all constituent items, on a 1-to-7 multipoint rating scale. MIC – mean inter-item correlation  SDIC – standard devation of inter-item correlations. Higher MICs connote greater homogeneity, lower SDICs connote greater unidimensionality. IAS-R Dominance, the adjectives Forceless, Unauthoritative, and Unbold were not in this data; for IAS-R Nurturance, the adjectives Tender, Tendherhearted, Gentlehearted, Coldhearted, Hardhearted, and Warmthless were not in this data.

For more detailed information, e.g., sets of factor loadings within each of the languages, contact Gerard Saucier (gsaucier@uoregon.edu).