

# UC Riverside

## UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

Personality-Related Problems and the Five-Factor Model of Personality

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6r76q9c4>

### Author

Boudreaux, Michael

### Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
RIVERSIDE

Personality-Related Problems and the Five-Factor Model of Personality

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

by

Michael Joseph Boudreaux

August 2014

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Daniel Ozer, Chairperson

Dr. David Funder

Dr. Sonja Lyubomirsky

Copyright by  
Michael Joseph Boudreaux  
2014

The Dissertation of Michael Joseph Boudreaux is approved:

---

---

---

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Dan, for providing me with an enriching work environment in which I could grow personally and intellectually. Since day one of arriving from a cross-country trip from Maryland to California, to moving once again, to St. Louis, MO, he has provided much support during my graduate tenure. I appreciate his quantitative rigor, immense intellectual talent, and sharp wit. I have learned many methodological and conceptual skills from him, but also how to approach tasks with just the right amount of openness and skepticism, and to think critically about personality traits and functioning, the topic of my dissertation. He has taught me the value of mentorship, as he provided both nurturance and support but also the freedom to pursue my own ideas. He was a superb personal and professional role model as well. I am proud and grateful to have had Dan as my advisor. I hope that we will continue to collaborate in the years to come.

I am also grateful to numerous other individuals. David and Sonja both provided professional support and intellectual insights into various projects over the years. They represent standards in the field that I hope to achieve. Many faculty and staff members have contributed to my development, including Bob Rosenthal, Chandra Reynolds, Kate Sweeney, Faye Harmer, and Dianne Fewkes. I am thankful to many students and colleagues at UCR, who have made my experience here an enjoyable one. I would like to thank Ralph Piedmont and Martin Sherman for their early support and guidance. I am grateful to my family, for giving me lots of love, teaching me to work carefully and conscientiously, and reminding me of the importance of family. I am thankful to Atra

Eslami, for providing balance in my life, reminding me of the joy of music and art, and allowing me to be myself. And finally, to Hugo, a wonderful companion, for taking me on plenty of walks and giving me lots of kindness and affection.

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Personality-Related Problems and the Five-Factor Model of Personality

by

Michael Joseph Boudreaux

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Psychology

University of California, Riverside, August 2014

Dr. Daniel Ozer, Chairperson

This research identifies a broad and inclusive set of personality-related problems and examines their empirical associations with both the high and low poles of the five-factor model of personality (FFM). McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues (e.g., McCrae, 1994; McCrae, Löckenhoff, & Costa, 2005; Widiger, Costa, & McCrae, 2002, 2012) have proposed that individuals with particular personality traits may be predisposed to particular kinds of problems in life, and suggested that the FFM serve as a basis for identifying personality-related problems. The existing empirical literature has documented a range of problems, symptoms, and impairments associated with the FFM trait domains, but these associations have been largely confined to the socially undesirable poles. Widiger and colleagues (e.g., Haigler & Widiger, 2001; Widiger, 2011) argue that problem behaviors are associated with both poles of the FFM, but that

normal-range FFM measures may be limited in covering maladaptive variants of socially desirable traits.

A list of 310 behaviorally-specific personality problems was developed and administered to a large college student sample. The International Personality Item Pool Representation of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (IPIP NEO-PI-R; Goldberg, 1999) and an experimental manipulation of the NEO-PI-R items (EXP NEO-PI-R; Haigler & Widiger, 2001) were also administered. The most prevalent problems of college students included difficulties with sustaining motivation, negative attitudes about self, and impaired functioning in social and intimate relationships. Numerous problem behaviors were associated with both the high and low poles of each trait domain and facet of the FFM, as measured by the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R. Patterns of problem reporting are consistent with dynamic theories of psychosocial development as well as recently emerging research on maladaptive behaviors across trait continua. Future research should evaluate the generality of the current list of personality problems against other representations of problem behavior, examine base rates of problem occurrence in non-student samples using self- and informant ratings, and investigate the psychological processes that might explain patterns of change and stability over time.



## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Defining Personality-Related Problems.....	2
Using the Five-Factor Model to Identify and Catalogue Personality Problems.....	3
Personality Disorders and the Five-Factor Model.....	6
Representation of Maladaptive Personality Traits Across the Poles of the Five-Factor Model.....	9
Overview of the Present Study.....	12
Method.....	12
Participants.....	12
Item Development: Identifying Personality-Related Problems From the “Bottom-Up”.....	13
Expanding Coverage of Personality Problems.....	15
Procedures for Writing Items.....	17
Ratings of Personality Problems.....	19
International Personality Item Pool Representations of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (IPIP NEO-PI-R).....	19
Experimental Manipulation of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (EXP NEO-PI-R).....	21
Procedures.....	22
Results.....	23
Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems.....	23
Correlations of Personality Problems with the Five-Factor Model.....	25
Discussion.....	31
Problem Behaviors Across Both Poles of Trait Continua.....	33
Toward Identifying Core Dimensions of Personality Problems.....	35
Future Directions and Limitations.....	37
Conclusion.....	38
References.....	40
Tables.....	46
Appendix.....	60

## Personality-Related Problems and the Five-Factor Model of Personality

Problems that people experience in their lives sometimes result not from major life stressors or acute mental disorders, but from longstanding and faulty patterns of interacting with the environment. Such problems may be said to be “personality-related” because they reflect enduring dispositions of the individual. Although a rich and now classic literature has documented the effects of environmental stressors on health and well-being (e.g., Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981), and clinical research has identified a range of psychological symptoms associated with psychopathology (e.g., Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974), research on everyday problems in living and their linkage to personality is relatively more recent (e.g., Widiger, Costa, & McCrae, 2002, 2012). The purpose of the current work is to continue this line of research by identifying a broad and inclusive set of personality problems and examining their empirical associations with personality traits.

I will begin by describing two complimentary views of personality-related problems and efforts to classify them using the five-factor model of personality (FFM). I will review empirical studies that have investigated relations between personality traits, disorders, and functioning, and discuss two interrelated issues from this research that bear directly on the theory and measurement of personality problems. These involve questions regarding the range of FFM measures in covering maladaptive personality traits and whether personality dysfunction is associated with one or both poles of each trait dimension. This will lead to a description of the current efforts, provided in the Method section, of developing a wide variety of items for assessing personality problems.

## Defining Personality-Related Problems

Personality-related problems are behavioral manifestations of relatively enduring and maladaptive patterns of thinking, feeling, and relating to others. They involve difficulties in self and interpersonal functioning (e.g., lacking ambition or motivational drive, avoiding people or social situations) that may cause distress, disrupt relationships, or interfere with goals and life tasks. Some view them as maladaptive personality traits (Widiger & Mullins-Sweatt, 2009) and others as chronic problems in living that arise from tenuous life adaptations (McCrae, Lichtenhoff, & Costa, 2005).

McCrae and Costa (1999) have outlined a theory of personality that may be applied to the study of personality problems. In five-factor theory (FFT), McCrae and Costa distinguish between personality traits and their concrete manifestations. Traits are defined as endogenous *basic tendencies* that arise from the operation of neuropsychological structures. They interact with external influences (e.g., cultural norms, life events) to create *characteristic adaptations*, including habits, attitudes, and skills.<sup>1</sup> Although these adaptations are intended to help the person fit into the environment, some may be maladaptive (e.g., pernicious habits, irrational beliefs, deficient social skills) and lead to personality problems (McCrae, Lichtenhoff, & Costa, 2005).

In a similar though slightly different view, Widiger and Mullins-Sweatt (2009) see personality problems as maladaptive variants of personality traits (e.g., aimless, socially withdrawn) that summarize patterns of problematic behaviors. Unlike McCrae

---

<sup>1</sup> Similar distinctions have been proposed by others, such as between genotypic and phenotypic traits (Wiggins, 1973) and source and surface traits (Cattell, 1950).

and Costa, they do not separate traits from behaviors nor do they make any causal statements about them, but do distinguish specific behaviors and problems from the broad trait dispositions they define. Widiger and colleagues have provided a list of personality-related problems (Widiger, Costa, & McCrae, 2002, 2012), as well as abbreviated measures of adaptive and maladaptive trait adjectives (Mullins-Sweatt, Jamerson, Samuel, Olson, & Widiger, 2006; Rojas & Widiger, 2014; Samuel, Mullins-Sweatt, & Widiger, 2013).

Both perspectives see personality-related problems as distinct from psychiatric syndromes (e.g., depression, anxiety) and psychosocial stressors (e.g., financial concerns, legal problems). Both views also emphasize the concrete impairments associated with personality traits. However, FFT calls attention to the ways in which personality traits are expressed and maintained in everyday behavior, though the specific mechanisms or processes have not yet been elucidated. And although it may be difficult to truly separate an assessment of maladaptive traits from an assessment of problematic behaviors, symptoms, or impairments, the notion that some difficulties in life are trait-related provides a starting place for examining personality problems.

### **Using the Five-Factor Model to Identify and Catalogue Personality Problems**

The FFM is the predominant paradigm in personality trait research. It is a hierarchical model of personality traits organized around five superordinate factors (the “Big Five”), each of which summarizes several more specific trait characteristics. At the highest-order level are the broad factors labeled Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism (vs. Emotional Stability), and Openness (or Intellect).

The Big Five were initially identified in analyses of trait descriptive adjectives in the natural language (see John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf, 1988), but have also been recovered in numerous personality inventories (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992). Thus, the FFM provides not only a descriptive taxonomy of personality trait terms represented in language, but also an organizing framework for systematizing a broad array of psychological constructs for studying personality.

McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues (McCrae, 1994; McCrae, Löckenhoff, & Costa, 2005; Widiger, Costa, & McCrae, 2002, 2012) have proposed that individuals with particular personality traits may be predisposed to particular kinds of problems in life, and suggested that the FFM serve as a basis for identifying personality-related problems. In generating a list of these kinds of problems, McCrae (1994) and Widiger, Costa, and McCrae (2002) used a rational approach. They considered each pole of each trait and proposed problems they thought would be common in people with this characteristic. For example, they suggested that people high in Agreeableness might be gullible and be easily taken advantage of, people low in Extraversion might be socially inhibited and lack social support networks, and people low in Conscientiousness might be unable to self-discipline and suffer from personal and occupational aimlessness. McCrae (1994) provided a list of problems at the highest-order level of the FFM, and Widiger et al. (2002), drawing from the *Structured Interview for the Five-Factor Model of Personality* (SIFFM; Trull & Widiger, 1997), extended it by identifying problems at the facet level. McCrae, Löckenhoff, and Costa (2005) further added to this list by examining the item content of five existing measures of personality and problems.

These efforts led to the *NEO Problems in Living Checklist* (NEO-PLC), developed to supplement the most recent edition of the *NEO Personality Inventory*, the *NEO Personality Inventory-3* (NEO-PI-3; McCrae & Costa, 2010). The NEO-PLC is described in the NEO-PI-3 manual as a tool for clinicians to assess problematic behaviors and symptoms associated with an individual's personality trait profile. It is not a self-report instrument, but was designed to serve as a guide for a focused clinical interview. Clinicians first assess a person's personality traits using the NEO-PI-3, and then inquire about problems that are secondary to high and low domain and facet scores. The items on the checklist are short descriptions of personality problems organized around high and low scores of each trait domain and facet (e.g., "episodes of intense and poorly controlled rage and fury," for high scores on Angry Hostility, a facet of Neuroticism).

McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues have produced an extensive catalogue of personality-related problems. Particularly noteworthy is the description of problems secondary to both the high and low poles of the FFM. However, as noted by McCrae, Löckenhoff, and Costa (2005), a need exists to supplement the catalogue with potential additional items from independent researchers who might take a different perspective on problems. Research is also needed to empirically document the hypothesized associations between problems and traits, and to examine basic descriptive data of problem reporting, such as base rates of problem occurrence. But before a program of research can begin to address these issues in general adult samples, a list of personality problems is required that can be easily understood by non-clinicians and individuals without psychological training. While McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues have generated a clinically rich set of

problems, many of these items are conceptually broad descriptions of personality dysfunction rather than specific social, emotional, or behavioral problems. A broad and inclusive set of personality problems written in nontechnical language and requiring only a minimum degree of inference is therefore needed; problems that can be easily recognized in everyday behavior and understood for self- and informant report administration.

Before describing the present efforts in developing a set of these kinds of problems, I will turn to a review of studies that have examined empirical relations between the FFM and personality dysfunction. Many of these studies have been conducted within the context of personality disorder research, involving numerous samples of adults with and without psychopathology, as well as college students. Many of the issues that have emerged from this literature are closely tied to, and have important implications for, the study of personality-related problems. These include the ability of FFM measures to assess the full range of personality traits and, relatedly, the extent to which both poles of each trait dimension are associated with maladaptive behavior.

### **Personality Disorders and the Five-Factor Model**

In recent years, researchers in personality and clinical psychology have been collaborating to advance the study of adaptive and maladaptive personality (e.g., Costa & Widiger, 2002; Strack, 2006). These investigators propose that personality pathology can be understood along a continuum of personality functioning, and that the FFM of general personality structure can provide the foundation to base the study of personality dysfunction. According to this perspective, individuals who score excessively high or low

on a personality trait dimension may be more likely to experience personality-related problems, and when these problems cause significant functional impairment or subjective distress, they may be classified within the general spectrum of personality disorders.

A burgeoning literature shows robust associations between the FFM and the personality disorders included within the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM; American Psychiatric Association, 1994, 2000). Much of this literature has been quantitatively summarized in two meta-analyses (Samuel & Widiger, 2008; Saulsman & Page, 2004). Saulsman and Page (2004) examined 12 studies (containing 15 samples) that reported correlations of the FFM domains with each of the DSM personality disorders. They reported that (high) Neuroticism and (low) Agreeableness were the two most prominent and consistent trait dimensions associated with the personality disorders. Moderate associations were observed for the low poles of Extraversion and Conscientiousness. Openness to Experience had the fewest and smallest associations. Samuel and Widiger (2008) replicated these results at the domain level using 18 independent samples, and extended them further by identifying associations at the facet level. Together, these results provide support for the ability of the FFM to represent personality disorders as extreme and/or maladaptive personality traits.

Because not everyone who scores very high or low on a measure of personality necessarily exhibits clinical-range pathology, many investigators (e.g., Livesley, 1998; Parker et al., 2002, 2004; Widiger, Costa, & McCrae, 2002; 2012) advocate a second step in the personality diagnostic process, including an assessment of self and interpersonal functioning. As described by FFT, personality dysfunction is reflected by characteristic



maladaptations, which are (in part) influenced by traits. But what is currently known about the kinds of problems or impairments in functioning that individuals with different personal styles and dispositions may be prone?

As described above, McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues have identified numerous problems in living that might be associated with the FFM. Hopwood et al. (2009), using data from the Collaborative Longitudinal Personality Disorders Study, examined the ability of the FFM trait domains to predict social, work, and recreational dysfunction. Neuroticism and low Extraversion were the two most common traits associated with impairment across all three domains of functioning. In addition, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness were each primarily and negatively associated with recreational, social, and work dysfunction, respectively. Mullins-Sweatt and Widiger (2010) reported similar associations using data obtained from a community sample of adults who were currently or recently in psychological treatment. Neuroticism was associated with affective distress, low Extraversion and low Agreeableness were associated with social impairment, and low Conscientiousness was associated with occupational impairment.

Boudreaux, Piedmont, Sherman, and Ozer (2013) further documented the specificity of these relations in samples of college students, and offered a checklist of problems based on students' free responses of problems (described below). They provided illustrative examples of concrete problems associated with each FFM trait domain. For example, Neuroticism was associated with socio-emotional problems (e.g., "feeling stressed or high-strung," "taking things too personally"); low Extraversion and

low Agreeableness were associated with interpersonal problems (e.g., “being unwilling to open up to others,” “being too critical or judgmental”); low Openness was associated with cognitive-behavioral problems (e.g., “being afraid of trying new things,” “being unable to work without clear rules and guidelines”); and low Conscientiousness was associated with motivational problems (e.g., “lacking direction in life,” “easily losing interest in assigned tasks”).

The joint study of adaptive and maladaptive personality is helping shed light on the implications of trait standing and nature of personality dysfunction. However, the majority of problems and impairments identified in this research reflect disproportionately maladaptive aspects of high Neuroticism, and low Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Widiger and colleagues (e.g., Haigler & Widiger, 2001; Widiger, 2011) argue that both poles of each trait dimension are associated with problem behaviors, but that normal-range FFM measures may be limited in covering maladaptive aspects of low Neuroticism, and high Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Specifically, they argue that a relative emphasis is placed on the adaptive expressions of these traits rather than their maladaptive variants.

**Representation of Maladaptive Traits Across the Poles of the Five-Factor Model.** To investigate the hypothesis that normal-range FFM measures may not provide an equal representation of adaptive and maladaptive traits across both poles of the FFM, Haigler and Widiger (2001) judged the number of items in the *Revised NEO Personality Inventory* (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) that describe desirable versus undesirable behavior for each trait domain. They coded 2% of the Neuroticism, 90% of the

Extraversion, 88% of the Openness, 83% of the Agreeableness, and 90% of the Conscientiousness items as indicating adaptive behavior when a person responds in the direction of a high level rather than a low level of the respective trait domain.

Interestingly, these percentages closely parallel the distribution of adaptive and maladaptive trait terms represented in the English language. Based on social desirability ratings of Goldberg's (1982) extensive list of 1,710 trait descriptive adjectives, Coker, Samuel, and Widiger (2002) reported significantly more desirable than undesirable terms at the high poles of Agreeableness (86%), Conscientiousness (80%), and Intellect, or Openness (74%). They reported a roughly equal number of desirable and undesirable terms for the high poles of Surgency, or Extraversion, (57%) and Emotional Instability, or Neuroticism (40%). These results support the construct validity of the NEO-PI-R, but also suggest that the NEO-PI-R and measures based on the Big Five underrepresent maladaptive aspects of socially desirable traits.

The disproportionate representation of maladaptive personality across both poles of the FFM raises the question of whether personality dysfunction is associated with all 10 poles. In theory, as Widiger and colleagues have argued, there are maladaptive variants of each pole. But traditional FFM measures are less likely to identify dysfunctional aspects of the more desirable poles (i.e., low Neuroticism, and high Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness). Several studies using the NEO-PI-R and other FFM instruments have indeed failed to provide consistent evidence for hypothesized relations of these traits with various personality disorders (Samuel & Widiger, 2008; Saulsman & Page, 2004).

To address this issue, Haigler and Widiger (2001) experimentally manipulated the NEO-PI-R items to emphasize maladaptive aspects of low Neuroticism, and high Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. They accomplished this by adding modifiers, such as “excessively,” “too much,” or “preoccupied with,” to items judged to describe desirable or adaptive behavior. For example, the Conscientiousness item, “I keep my belongings neat and clean,” was revised to “I keep my belongings excessively neat and clean.” Haigler and Widiger reported moderate to strong correlations of the experimentally revised scales (with the exception of low Neuroticism) with personality pathology. Specifically, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness were each primarily and positively associated with antisocial, schizotypal, dependent, and obsessive-compulsive personality disorder, respectively.

These results signal a call for additional research to investigate maladaptive aspects of both poles of personality traits using traditional and alternative measures of the FFM. Several instruments are available for an assessment of general personality structure (see De Raad & Perugini, 2002). Among these, the NEO-PI-R is the leading measure. An advantage of the NEO-PI-R over other FFM instruments is the specification of each broad domain in terms of more specific facet traits, providing a more nuanced description of personality. Several alternative measures have been developed by Widiger and colleagues, including the Experimental Manipulation of the NEO-PI-R (EXP NEO-PI-R; Haigler & Widiger, 2001), the SIFFM (Trull & Widiger, 1997), and abbreviated, 30-item trait adjective measures corresponding to the 30 facets of the NEO-PI-R (Mullins-Sweatt,

Jamerson, Samuel, Olson, & Widiger, 2006; Rojas & Widiger, 2014; Samuel, Mullins-Sweatt, & Widiger, 2013).

### **Overview of the Present Study**

The purpose of the present study is to develop a broad and inclusive set of personality problems and examine their empirical relations with both the high and low poles of the FFM. As described below, these items were derived from individuals' open-ended self-reports of problems and two measures of personality. A total of 310 personality problems was developed and administered to a large sample of college students. Two measures of the FFM were used to assess relations of these problems with personality traits: the International Personality Item Pool Representation of the NEO-PI-R (IPIP NEO-PI-R; Goldberg, 1999) and the Experimental Manipulation of the NEO-PI-R (EXP NEO-PI-R; Haigler & Widiger, 2001).

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants consisted of 418 undergraduate students (239 women, 178 men, 1 did not indicate their gender) enrolled at a public university in Southern California. Average age was 19.3 years ( $SD = 1.6$ ; range = 18 to 38); 41.4% were Asian or Pacific Islander, 32.8% were Hispanic, 10.3% were White, 4.1% were African American, 5% were Middle Eastern or Indian, and 6.5% were mixed, other, or had missing data. Fifty-seven participants (13.6%) reported receiving counseling at least once in their lifetime; average time in counseling was approximately 9 months ( $SD = 22.7$ ; range = 1 week to 13 years). Eleven of those who received counseling reported being diagnosed with a mental disorder

(e.g., depression, bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder). All participants volunteered and received course credit for their participation.

### **Item Development: Identifying Personality-Related Problems from the “Bottom-Up”**

A fundamental issue in developing a set of items for a psychological assessment is how to best identify specific instances of the construct under study. One might begin with theoretical concepts and, by a process of deduction, identify the defining features. Working from the “top-down,” McCrae, Widiger, and colleagues used the constructs of the FFM to hypothesize about potential problems. As described above, this process led to a conceptually meaningful set of items. The FFM offers a comprehensive description of personality traits and, to the extent that personality-related problems share a similar structure, may also provide an efficient means for classifying personality pathology.

An alternative approach is to work from the “bottom-up.” This method involves identifying problem behaviors without referring to a theoretical structure, and then progressing to classification once a sufficient number of observations have been recorded and a stable pattern of organization gradually emerges. The internal structure of specific problems, specified via factor analytic procedures, can then be checked against theoretically derived “syndromes” or larger patterns of dysfunction to ensure comprehensiveness. This is an empirical method of item specification that can potentially lead to a set of real-world problems that people experience in their natural environments.

However, no transparent or straightforward means exists to guide the collection of problems from the bottom-up. One might use clinicians’ insights into psychiatric

problems that have become codified within the criterion sets of the DSM. However, research suggests that Axis II diagnostic criteria are incomplete descriptions of personality pathology (Westen & Arkowitz-Westen, 1998). Another strategy is to simply ask people about their problems in an open-ended response format. Some of the earliest research programs on personal problems have in fact taken this approach (e.g., Mooney & Gordon, 1950), and have identified numerous difficulties in life that people experience. Another strategy is to consult previously established inventories of personality and problems and write items based on the content of those measures, an approach often used in the assessment literature.

Boudreaux, Piedmont, Sherman, and Ozer (2013) used a bottom-up approach to item generation. They asked college students to list problems across three domains of functioning, including their (1) social and romantic relationships, (2) thoughts, feelings, and attitudes, and (3) occupational and educational activities. Approximately 152 undergraduate and graduate students participated in the study. Boudreaux et al. wrote specific problems from their responses and developed a checklist of problems, the Multi-Context Problems Checklist (MCPC). They demonstrated the reliability and validity of the MCPC in both self- and observer ratings of problems using three independent samples. Data from self-reports showed that the MCPC captures personally salient issues of college students, observer reports showed scores to be consensually valid, and associations with personality traits, subjective well-being, and psychological distress provided evidence of construct validity.

Asking participants in an open-ended format to report their personal concerns is a valuable approach to identifying problems. An advantage of this approach is that it can identify problems from the participants' point of view that simultaneously characterize aspects of their psychosocial contexts and important intrapsychic dynamics. However, this approach is also limited. One limitation is that college students' problems may not generalize to other adults or to people with severely disordered personality functioning. The initial sample from which the items of the MCPC were derived was homogenous with respect to age ( $Mean = 24, SD = 5$ ), gender (86% female), and ethnicity (82% White). Moreover, this approach depends on what people are willing and able to say about themselves. Sometimes, people may have little insight into their behavior. Therefore, additional sources of data are needed.

**Expanding Coverage of Personality Problems.** In order to expand coverage of problems, two measures of personality and problems were reviewed: McCrae and Costa's (2010) NEO-PLC and Block's (1961, 2008) *California Adult Q-set (CAQ)*.<sup>2</sup> As described above, the NEO-PLC contains 248 items written by clinical and personality psychologists, organized by the high and low poles of each trait domain and facet of the NEO-PI-3. The CAQ consists of 100 personality descriptors also developed by clinically-oriented psychologists to provide a quantitative assessment of personality. In order to ensure broad coverage of personality problems, each item on both instruments was

---

<sup>2</sup> Any reasonably comprehensive measure of personality and problems could have been used for this purpose. However, the NEO-PLC is an extensive catalogue of personality-related problems. The CAQ was chosen because it also provides comprehensive coverage of personality functioning, and may assess characteristics not contained within the FFM (e.g., humor, honesty, sensuality) (Block, 2010).



characterized by at least one problem. Table 1 presents examples of problems adapted from the NEO-PLC and CAQ.

As a first step, problems derived from students' open-ended responses were classified by the descriptions of personality and personality dysfunction within the NEO-PLC and CAQ. For example, under the NEO-PLC item "inappropriate suppression of feelings of anger or hostility when confronted with substantial provocation, exploitation, or abuse," the self-reported problem "being unable to express anger toward another person" was categorized. Similarly, under the CAQ item "is thin-skinned; sensitive to anything that can be construed as criticism or an interpersonal slight," the problem "getting easily hurt by criticism" was classified. After tabulating problems, new items were written to cover any gaps. For example, based on the NEO-PLC item "preoccupation with unusual, aberrant, or strange ideas; reality testing can be tenuous" I wrote the problem "believing in things others find bizarre or irrational." Similarly, for the CAQ item "tends to be rebellious and non-conforming" I wrote "acting too rebellious and non-conforming." To characterize the opposite of this item, I wrote "conforming to social norms and expectations too much."<sup>3</sup> Items derived from each instrument were then cross-classified in the other measure (e.g., the item "acting too rebellious and non-conforming," written from the CAQ, was classified by the NEO-PLC item "rebellious rejection of conventionality; defiance of cultural norms").<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Problem variants of *both* poles were characterized for most CAQ items.

<sup>4</sup> In working with these instruments, I aimed to identify specific problems that are well represented by the items on these measures, but did not intend to necessarily have an exact, one-to-one correspondence between problems and items.

**Procedures for Writing Items.** In writing items amenable for self-report administration, efforts were made to (1) describe problems in brief, concrete, and observable terms (2) that emphasize what people are actually doing, (3) as expressed in natural, everyday language. To meet my first goal, items were written in the form of short, verb phrases (e.g., “taking too many risks,” “having trouble finding creative solutions to problems”). Conditional statements (e.g., “taking too many risks when I’ve had too much to drink”) and idiomatic expressions (e.g., “being unable to think ‘outside the box’”) were avoided, but modifiers (e.g., “too much,” “overly”) were used for some items to emphasize the problematic content of the behavior. A behavioral anchor was given to those items that are perhaps less observable to make them more palpable and concrete (e.g., “difficulty verbalizing thoughts and ideas”).

Similarly, to emphasize behaviors rather than trait attributes, I used present participles (i.e., verbs taking the –ing form) and minimized the use of trait descriptive adjectives. I hoped to elicit an objective perspective by drawing attention to the content of the behavior instead of the implied trait. As a few examples, in place of “gullible,” “perfectionistic,” and “hostile,” I wrote “trusting people too easily,” “needing to do things perfectly,” and “being too quick to anger,” respectively. Observable, concrete, and behavioral items may require less time and inference from the respondent than dispositional terms, and may have as an advantage less error variance due to idiosyncratic interpretations of the item (Hendriks, Hofstee, & De Raad, 1999). Moreover, respondents might be less defensive when responding to problems in the form of behaviors rather than in the form of socially undesirable or maladaptive traits.

My final goal was to avoid jargon by writing items in the natural, everyday language people use when talking about their problems. As Horowitz (1979) noted in his analysis of interpersonal problems reported during clinical interviews, problems are often expressed in the form “It is hard for me to (do something desired)” or “I (do something undesired) too much.” This pattern of problem reporting was also evident in college students’ open-ended self-reports. Behaviors that people find hard to do may be thought of as behavioral inhibitions, and behaviors that people do too much can be thought of as behavioral excesses (Pincus & Wiggins, 1992).<sup>5</sup> Several problems, though not all, reflect inhibitions and excesses. Examples of behavioral inhibitions are “having trouble asserting myself” and “difficulty opening up to others.” Examples of behavioral excesses include “thinking about sex too much” and “using drugs or alcohol too much.”

Through an iterative process of revisiting each source, revising items, and writing new items based on my own personal observations and readings of the problem literature, a preliminary list of 310 problems was developed (additional items were subsequently written during various stages of data collection, bringing the total count to 400). Since the initial study reported in Boudreaux et al., several of the items derived from students’ free responses were revised to improve the readability and behavioral focus of each problem, and several others were discarded for being overly specific, vague, or unrelated to personality.

---

<sup>5</sup> The psychological meaning of behavioral inhibitions and excesses is not always straightforward. Inhibitions can be excessive (e.g., “hesitating too much,” “being overly cautious”) and excesses may involve not only undesirable but also desirable behavior (e.g., “being overly protective of loved ones,” “being unrealistically or excessively optimistic”). Thus, characterizing problems as inhibitions and excesses based on semantic meaning alone may be misleading.

**Ratings of Personality Problems.** Participants in the current sample were asked to indicate how much they *usually* experience each of the 310 problems on a scale from 0 to 3 (0 = “not a problem,” 1 = “a minor problem,” 2 = “a moderate problem,” 3 = “a serious problem”).

At the end of the questionnaire, participants were also asked to list three or more problems that they were experiencing or have experienced in the last year in each of three areas: relationships with other people, goals and motivation, and self-related thoughts, feelings, and attitudes. An “other” category was also provided to list other difficulties. Participants were instructed to be as specific as possible.

Ten duplicate items were included to identify inconsistent response patterns. The items were interspersed among the problems, presented after every 30 questions. Scores were computed by subtracting each item from its duplicate and then summing the absolute differences for each participant. Dividing by 30 (i.e., the maximum possible score on a 4-point scale) provides a POMP score (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken, & West, 1999). The average *summed absolute difference* was 3.75 ( $SD = 2.58$ ; range = 0 to 16), or an average POMP inconsistency score of .12 ( $SD = .09$ ). Cases with a POMP score greater than .33 were excluded from all analyses. Nine of 418 cases (2.15%) were removed.<sup>6</sup>

**International Personality Item Pool Representation of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (IPIP NEO-PI-R).** In collaboration with researchers in the

---

<sup>6</sup> All analyses were performed on both the full dataset, and on data with deletions. Minor variations in descriptive statistics were found, but none of these differences impacted any substantive interpretations. Parallel analyses were performed on the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R, described below. Similar variations in descriptive statistics were found, but again these do not impact interpretations of the results.

Netherlands and Germany, Goldberg (1999) developed a set of over 2,000 items, collectively called the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). By administering these items with a series of commercial personality inventories, the research team was able to develop scales to measure constructs similar to those assessed by these inventories. The scale proxies were subsequently made available in the public domain (<http://ipip.ori.org>).

One such measure formed by these items is the IPIP representation of the NEO-PI-R. As previously described, the NEO-PI-R was designed to measure the trait domains of the FFM. Each trait domain is operationalized in terms of six facet traits. For example, Neuroticism includes the six facet scales of Anxiety, Angry Hostility, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Impulsiveness, and Vulnerability. The NEO-PI-R has been used extensively in research and applied contexts as diverse as counseling and clinical psychology, behavioral medicine, industrial-organizational psychology, and educational psychology (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

The IPIP representation of the NEO-PI-R includes 300 items in the form of short, verb phrases (e.g., “make friends easily,” “trust others”) rated on a scale from 1 (*Very Inaccurate*) to 5 (*Very Accurate*). Tables comparing the psychometric characteristics of the original NEO-PI-R scales with the IPIP proxies can be found on the IPIP website. Alpha reliabilities generally match or exceed those of the NEO-PI-R, and are highly correlated with their parent scales (see also Goldberg et al., 2006). In the current sample, alpha reliabilities for the domain scales range from .89 to .93 (*Mdn.* = .92), and for the facet scales, alphas range from .58 to .88 (*Mdn.* = .78).

Ten validity items were written to reflect the semantic opposite of 10 IPIP NEO-PI-R items. For example, for the item “feel comfortable around people,” the semantic opposite “feel uncomfortable around people” was written. Two items were written for each trait domain with one item reflecting each pole of each trait. Each of the 10 items was listed after every 30 questions. After reverse scoring, each validity item was subtracted from its opposite, the absolute difference summed for each participant, and then divided by 40. The average *summed absolute difference* was 6.26 ( $SD = 3.87$ ; range = 0 to 35), or a POMP inconsistency score of .16 ( $SD = .10$ ). Cases with a POMP score greater than .33 were excluded from all analyses. Seven of 197 cases (3.55%) were removed.

**Experimental Manipulation of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (EXP NEO-PI-R).** Recognizing that the NEO-PI-R may be somewhat limited in covering the full range of maladaptive variants of each trait domain of the FFM, Haigler and Widiger (2001) experimentally manipulated the NEO-PI-R items in order to capture maladaptive aspects of the more desirable poles of the FFM. They reversed the direction of adaptiveness of every item without changing the direction in which the item was keyed or otherwise altering the content of the item. They accomplished this by adding modifiers such as “excessively,” “too much,” or “preoccupied with” to describe a maladaptive variant of the same trait to which the item refers. For example, the Conscientiousness item, “I think things through before coming to a decision,” was revised to “I think about things too much before coming to a decision.” Items judged to describe undesirable or maladaptive behavior were likewise altered to describe desirable or adaptive behavior.

Haigler and Widiger reported convergent correlations between the EXP NEO-PI-R and NEO-PI-R to be positive and moderate to strong, ranging from .43 for Conscientiousness to .67 for Openness to Experience.

Similar to the validity scale created for the IPIP NEO-PI-R, 10 items were written to reflect the semantic opposite of 10 EXP NEO-PI-R items. For example, for the item “I am easy-going and relaxed,” the semantic opposite “I am not easy-going and relaxed” was written. Two items were written for each trait domain with one item reflecting each pole of each trait. The items were interspersed after every 25 questions. After reverse scoring, each validity item was subtracted from its opposite, the absolute difference summed for each participant, and then divided by 40. The average *summed absolute difference* score was 7.97 ( $SD = 4.35$ ; range = 0 to 33), or a POMP inconsistency score of .20 ( $SD = .11$ ). Cases with a POMP score greater than .33 were excluded from all analyses. Twenty of 209 cases (9.57%) were removed.

## **Procedures**

A variety of questionnaires, including the list of personality problems, IPIP NEO-PI-R, and EXP NEO-PI-R, were administered over the Internet using online survey software and were completed in two 1-hour sessions. All participants participated on their personal computers. After completing the first session, participants were emailed a link to the second session within 72 hours. Because the participants were asked to respond to a large number of items, not everyone completed all scales. To help ensure the quality of the data, validity scales were created to detect inconsistent responding.

To reduce response burden, the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R were divided across the sample. Specifically, the first half of the sample to sign up for the study received the IPIP NEO-PI-R, and the second half received the EXP NEO-PI-R. The full sample received the preliminary list of 310 personality problems.

## **Results**

The results are presented in two sections: descriptive statistics of personality problems and correlations of problems with the FFM. To examine base rates of problem reporting, means, standard deviations, and other descriptive statistics are presented for the overall sample and for each gender separately. Gender differences are examined, and the results of independent-samples significance tests and associated effect sizes are provided. To examine associations between problems and personality traits, each problem was correlated with the 70 domain and facet scales of the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R (35 scales per instrument). Frequency distributions of correlations between problems and domain scores are compared across the high and low poles of each instrument, and examples of correlations at the item-level of individual problems are presented across both poles of each facet scale.

### **Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems**

Table 2 presents the 10 highest and lowest problems of college students (see the Appendix for descriptive information for the list of 310 problems, overall and separated by gender). Interestingly, the highest rated problems in the present sample are similar to those reported by college students nearly five decades ago. For example, De Sena (1966) reported that “not getting enough sleep,” “easily distracted from my work,” “being timid



or shy,” “not enough time for recreation,” and “not knowing how to study effectively” were among the most prevalent problems of college students reported on the Mooney Problems Check List (Mooney & Gordon, 1950). Very few individuals in the present sample reported “getting into trouble with the law,” “having too many sexual partners,” and “having a reputation for being untrustworthy,” for example.

Table 3 presents examples of problems rated differently by men and women. As shown, women were significantly more likely than men to endorse “crying too easily,” “feeling disgusted about my body,” and “acting awkwardly around others.” In contrast, men were significantly more likely than women to endorse “thinking about sex too much,” “having a dark sense of humor,” and “being seen as arrogant or conceited.” These results are consistent with epidemiological research showing gender differences for some personality disorders (e.g., a higher percentage of women being diagnosed with borderline and histrionic, and a higher percentage of men being diagnosed with narcissistic and antisocial) (Trull, Jahng, Tomko, Wood, & Sher, 2010).

As shown in the Appendix, many problems have positively skewed distributions, indicating that most people used the lower end of the rating scale. Even the highest mean rating of 1.58 for “procrastinating too much” is just beyond the mid-point of the 0 to 3 rating scale (i.e., between a “minor” and “moderate” problem). The standard deviation for most problems was sizeable (the average standard deviation across all problems was .79), and the full range of the scale was used for every problem. Moreover, most problems have distributions with positive excess kurtosis, indicating that many people fall in the left tail of the distribution.

### **Correlations of Personality Problems with the Five-Factor Model**

Table 4 presents the frequency distributions of problem-trait correlates across the poles of each trait domain of the FFM. Correlations with a magnitude of at least .15 were counted for each pole of each broad domain. For the undesirable poles (i.e., high N, low E, O, A, and C), there was a substantial number of correlations between problems and the IPIP NEO-PI-R. For example, there were 278 correlations for high Neuroticism and 127 correlations for low Extraversion. The reason there were so few correlations of problems with the EXP NEO-PI-R is because the direction of adaptiveness is reversed in this instrument. Specifically, items reflecting high Neuroticism, and low Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, which more often than not describe maladaptive behavior, were altered to describe more adaptive behavior.

For the desirable poles (i.e., low N, high E, O, A, and C), in comparison, the distribution reverses for the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R. For example, although there was only 1 problem associated with high Agreeableness using the IPIP NEO-PI-R, there were 165 problems associated with high Agreeableness using the EXP NEO-PI-R. It is important to note that, while fewer significant correlations emerged at the domain level of the more desirable poles of the IPIP NEO-PI-R, a greater number of significant relations emerged at the facet level, though these correlations were still much lower in magnitude as compared to the EXP NEO-PI-R.

Tables 5 through 9 show representative problems associated with each pole of each trait facet of the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R. For traits with few or no significant correlations, problems were included with values of at least .10 for illustrative

purposes. A description of each trait dimension and associated problems are presented below. For the undesirable poles, text examples are taken from the IPIP NEO-PI-R, and for the desirable poles, text examples are taken from the EXP NEO-PI-R.

Neuroticism is a core trait of psychopathology. It refers to a general tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anxiousness, anger or irritability, and depressiveness. As shown in Table 5, problems associated with these traits include “worrying too much,” “being too quick to anger,” and “feeling hopeless or depressed,” respectively. Neuroticism also refers to self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability. Problems associated with these traits include “feeling fearful or nervous in social situations,” “difficulty budgeting money,” and “getting easily overwhelmed,” respectively. Similar content at the high end of Neuroticism is observed across both the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R, although the magnitude of the correlations is stronger in the IPIP NEO-PI-R.

In contrast, problems associated with low scores on Neuroticism are quite distinct, reflecting externalizing problem behavior, such as excessive risk-taking and acting out against others. Low anxiousness, for example, was associated with “taking too many risks,” “excessively seeking thrills,” and “cheating or stealing from others.” Low depressiveness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability were associated with “cheating on my partner or spouse,” “having a reputation for being untrustworthy,” and “being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others,” respectively. Although the observed correlations are small to moderate in size, these problems are consistent with the literature on psychopathy (e.g., Cleckley, 1976) and avoidance motivation (e.g., Fowles,

1980; Lykken, 1995). People who are less sensitive to punishment may act impulsively and exhibit antisocial behavior.

Extraversion refers to being sociable and outgoing, but also includes traits such as assertiveness, cheerfulness, and energy. Although Extraversion is a strong predictor of subjective well-being (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1980; Lucas & Baird, 2004), those who are low in Extraversion are not necessarily unhappy with their lives, but they may be at higher risk for experiencing certain kinds of problems, such as problems in social relationships. For example, as shown in Table 6, those who are low in warmth and gregariousness reported “difficulty developing close and lasting relationships” and “acting shy around others,” and those low in assertiveness reported “difficulty taking the lead” and “being unable to stand up to others.” Other facets of Extraversion reflect energy and enthusiasm. Those scoring low on activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions reported “not having good work or study habits,” “being afraid of trying new things,” and “feeling emotionally dull or bland,” respectively.

These core features of Extraversion, sociability, assertiveness, and energy, are also clearly marked by problems at the high poles. The sociability component, reflected by high warmth and gregariousness, includes problems such as “getting too attached to others” and “talking too much.” Assertiveness includes “being seen as arrogant or conceited” and “bossing around others too much.” The energetic component, reflected by activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions, includes “being hyperactive,” “excessively seeking thrills,” and “being giddy and overly excitable,” respectively. In short, maladaptive aspects of low Extraversion reflect behavior that is socially

withdrawn, lethargic, and dull, whereas maladaptive aspects of high Extraversion reflect behavior that is socially dominant, intense, and may be irresponsible or reckless.

Openness to Experience refers to the tendency to seek out and be receptive to new experiences in life. In the lexical tradition of the Big Five, Openness is referred to as Intellect. Openness might thus be thought of as comprising two aspects (DeYoung, Quilty, & Peterson, 2007). One aspect describes people who are imaginative, aesthetically sensitive, and open to feelings, whereas the other describes people who value intellectual matters and are open to new ideas and new ways of thinking about things. As shown in Table 7, people low in openness to fantasy, aesthetics, and feelings reported “lacking in emotional depth,” “difficulty appreciating art and culture,” and “being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others,” respectively. Those low in Intellect, or those who are closed to actions, ideas, and values, reported “being afraid of trying new things,” “having trouble finding creative solutions to problems,” and “having trouble accepting things I don’t agree with,” respectively.

In comparison, people who are highly open to experience may be too involved in their own internal worlds. Those with high scores in fantasy, aesthetics, and feelings, for example, reported “getting lost in fantasy,” “feeling stuck or stifled by society’s rules and expectations,” and “being easily affected by emotions,” respectively. Those who are open to actions, ideas, and values reported problems resembling a schizotypal personality pattern, such as “being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas,” “difficulty recognizing social cues,” and “believing in things others find bizarre or irrational.” Thus, people who are high in openness may be excessively imaginative, detached from

society's conventions, and hold beliefs that are not well-grounded in reality, whereas those who are low in Openness appear to lack imagination and curiosity, and may reject certain ideas or values without due consideration.

Agreeableness is primarily manifest in people's social interactions, ranging from compassion to antagonism. Agreeable people tend to be warm and altruistic, whereas disagreeable people tend to be egocentric and hostile. As shown in Table 8, people low in trust, altruism, and tender-mindedness reported "difficulty trusting people," "being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others," and "arguing with people too much," respectively. Ashton and Lee (2005) have shown that the straightforwardness and modesty facets of Agreeableness are good markers of the Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO model of personality traits. Problems characteristic of low scores on straightforwardness include "taking advantage of others" and "cheating or stealing from others," and problems associated with low scores on modesty include "feeling deserving of special treatment" and "being seen as arrogant or conceited."

The low pole of Agreeableness resembles the neurotic tendency that Horney (1945) described as "moving *against* people." In comparison, the high pole of Agreeableness describes what she called "moving *toward* people." People high in trust, altruism, and tender-mindedness, for example, reported "trusting people too easily," "forgiving people too easily," and "being overly protective of loved ones," respectively. However, problems associated with other facets of Agreeableness reflect both inter- and *intrapersonal* aspects of behavior. For example, problems associated with high compliance include "having trouble planning for the future" and "being easily influenced

by others,” and problems associated with high modesty include “being preoccupied with negative thoughts about myself” and “feeling like the cause of problems.”

Conscientiousness describes individual differences in goal-directed behavior. People high in Conscientiousness tend to be efficient and hard-working, whereas those low in Conscientiousness tend to be inefficient and lax. As shown in Table 9, those with low scores on competence, order, achievement striving, and self-discipline, for example, reported “having trouble putting strategies in place to achieve my goals,” “being disorganized,” “lacking ambition or motivational drive,” and “having trouble getting started on things,” respectively. Conscientiousness also refers to the capacity to exert control over oneself. People low in deliberation reported “making hasty or careless decisions” and “having trouble staying focused,” and those low in dutifulness reported “cheating or stealing from others” and “not following through with commitments.”

Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, and Goldberg (2005) identified two subcomponents of Conscientiousness. The first component, “industriousness,” is characterized by achievement motivation. People who are pathologically high on this trait might be described as workaholics. Characteristic problems include “pushing too hard to excel” and “having trouble accepting loss or failure.” The other component, “order,” refers to behavior that is organized and methodical. Problems associated with this trait include “needing to do things perfectly” and “being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization.” In addition, Conscientiousness includes self-efficacy beliefs and behavioral control. For example, high competence was associated with “needing to do things my way” and “getting angry when my independence is threatened,”

and high deliberation was associated with “being unable to act spontaneously” and “being afraid of taking chances.”

### **Discussion**

This research identified numerous problems in living that were empirically shown to be related to personality in conceptually meaningful ways. Although the average severity rating for the majority of problems was low in the current college student sample, there was sufficient variability to suggest that many students face significant problems in life that may have consequential impact on their well-being, quality of social and intimate relationships, and academic and occupational success. Many of the most prevalent problems included difficulties with sustaining motivation to achieve goals (e.g., “procrastinating too much,” “getting easily distracted”), negative attitudes about self (e.g., “being overly critical of myself,” “being preoccupied with negative thoughts about myself”), and impaired functioning in social and intimate relationships (e.g., “putting other people’s needs before my own,” “difficulty opening up to others”).

According to FFT, personality problems may emerge when a person has failed to achieve adaptive capacities (e.g., beliefs, attitudes, skills) for interacting effectively with the environment. These adaptations are jointly affected by personality traits and external influences. Similarly, Livesley (1998) viewed personality dysfunction as arising when “the structure of personality prevents the person from achieving adaptive solutions to universal life tasks” (p. 141). In order to function effectively, he argued, people must solve the tasks of establishing (1) an adaptive self-system (stable and integrated views of



oneself and others), (2) the capacity for close and intimate relationships, and (3) the ability to function cooperatively within social groups.

Life task analysis (Cantor, 1990) can be applied at multiple levels. Some tasks are idiosyncratic concerns that a person develops for him or herself during a specified period of life. Others are culturally imposed, and still others are more universal, affecting all individuals regardless of race or creed. While Livesley focused on the more abstract level of evolutionarily significant universal life tasks, examining tasks at the cultural level might also prove valuable.

As one example, Erikson (1963), writing from a Western perspective, proposed eight stages of psychosocial development that involve a “crisis” or conflict that must be resolved in order for the person to cope effectively. In late adolescence and early adulthood, for example, individuals work through questions regarding their identity and the roles they play in various social contexts. Successful resolution of this stage leads to identity achievement, in which the person attains an integrated understanding of who he or she is. If the conflict is not resolved, he or she may lack a clear sense of identity and have trouble advancing to the next stage of development.

The behavioral manifestations of unresolved conflicts could be understood as personality-related problems. Indeed, Erikson associated each stage with a particular psychopathology. He also thought, like Freud (1905/1962), that earlier crises could reemerge, and take specific forms across the lifespan. For example, the core pathologies associated with the first two stages, “trust versus mistrust” and “autonomy versus shame and doubt,” are withdrawal and compulsion, respectively. If basic trust isn’t learned, the

person may feel insecure about having his or her basic needs met and have difficulty forming close relationships. If autonomy isn't learned, the person may lack confidence in his or her abilities and excessively ruminate over decisions.

While the resolution of these two stages clearly leans toward trust and autonomy, one might wonder, like many contemporary researchers do, if it might also be maladaptive to be too trusting or too autonomous. For example, some cynicism is needed to avoid being taken advantage; too much trust can lead to a failure to recognize that some people should be avoided. Similarly, some doubt is needed in order to keep one's level of confidence in check; too much autonomy can lead to an excessive need to do things oneself, and a failure to recognize the contributions of others. Interestingly, Freud (1905/1962) hypothesized that unresolved conflicts could be expressed in opposite ways. For example, a person fixated at the oral stage may be too dependent on others, or fiercely independent; a person fixated at the anal stage may be compulsively organized and obedient, or excessively disorganized and disobedient.

### **Problem Behaviors Across Both Poles of Trait Continua**

Instead of focusing on unresolved psychic conflicts, trait researchers study the overt behavioral consistencies that characterize persons over time and across situations. However, like Freud, Widiger and colleagues (e.g., Haigler & Widiger, 2001; Widiger, 2011) have argued that problem behaviors are associated with both the high and low poles of trait continua. The results reported here support this contention, and are consistent with similar other studies that have examined maladaptive aspects of each pole of the Big Five. In Coker, Samuel, and Widiger's (2002) content analysis of Goldberg's

(1982) trait descriptive adjectives, for example, both desirable and undesirable trait terms were found at each of the 10 poles (though in unequal proportions). Thus, quite a few undesirable terms characterized high Surgency, or Extraversion (e.g., flaunty, showy), high Agreeableness (e.g., dependent, ingratiating), high Conscientiousness (e.g., leisureless, stringent), high Intellect, or Openness (e.g., rebellious, unconventional), and even low Emotional Instability, or Neuroticism (e.g., conscienceless, unemotional). Haigler and Widiger (2001), by reversing the direction of adaptiveness of every item in the NEO-PI-R, demonstrated strong correlations between high Extraversion and antisocial, high Openness and schizotypal, high Agreeableness and dependent, and high Conscientiousness and obsessive-compulsive, personality disorders.

Other evidence for the existence of maladaptiveness across both poles of trait continua was recently shown in a novel three-part study by Pettersson and colleagues (2014). Based on Edwards (1969), they suggested that there are at least two important sources of variation in people's response patterns to questionnaire items. One is based on the perceived valence of the items (i.e., whether an item refers to a positive or negative characteristic) and the other on the items' descriptive content. They further argued that once evaluative variance is isolated, any remaining non-evaluative dimensions would show maladaptive content at each pole. In Study 1, they demonstrated that the first factor to emerge in a factor analysis of 77 pairs of opposing items grouped the items by valence regardless of descriptive content. In Study 2, they replicated this result using data from item scores on the *Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality* (Clark, 1993), and went further to show that, once the evaluative factor was statistically controlled, the

resulting factor structure revealed bipolarity with maladaptive descriptors at both ends. These factors were labeled internalizing versus externalizing, detachment versus narcissism (or exhibitionism), and disinhibition versus constraint. In Study 3, they developed a new instrument that balances items for evaluate and descriptive content. A cluster analysis showed inverse relations among traits within clusters, indicating that maladaptive behaviors exist at both poles of trait continua.

### **Toward Identifying Core Dimensions of Personality Problems**

The results of the current study contribute to the literature on trait-related problems by identifying numerous impairments in functioning that are associated with each pole of each trait domain and facet of the FFM, as measured by the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R. A next step in this research is to move beyond describing the many behavioral manifestations of problems and work toward achieving a more integrative understanding of problem behavior. One could use for this purpose, the central features of the Big Five that are shared in various conceptions of personality. The NEO-PI-R offers one such conceptualization, among many others. One alternative representation of the lower-order facet structure of personality traits is the Abridged Big Five Dimensional Circumplex (AB5C; Hofstee, de Raad, & Goldberg, 1992). DeYoung, Quilty, and Peterson (2007) factor analyzed the 45 AB5C facet scales together with the 30 NEO-PI-R facet scales, and reported two core “aspects” of each Big Five dimension. Given the results reported here, personality problems would likely also map on to each pole of the 10 Big Five aspects, and these intermediate-level factors may help to conceptually consolidate the numerous problem-trait correlates.

However, the extent to which personality problems and the Big Five share a similar structure would need to be determined empirically. One could use multivariate statistical procedures to uncover the core dimensions of personality problems. For example, in a principal factor analysis of 91 child psychiatric symptoms, Achenbach (1966) reported two principal factors. The first bipolar factor contrasted *Internalizing* symptoms (e.g., “fearful,” “withdrawn,” “obsessions”) with *Externalizing* symptoms (e.g., “disobedient,” “lying,” “fighting”). The second unipolar factor was labeled *Severe and Diffuse Psychopathology*, and consisted of problems such as “bizarre behavior,” “fantastic thinking,” and “ideas of reference.” Similarly, Krueger (1999) examined the structure of 10 common mental disorders using confirmatory factor analysis, and reported a higher-order *Internalizing* factor – which subsumed “anxious-misery” (e.g., major depressive episode, generalized anxiety disorder) and “fear” (e.g., agoraphobia, panic disorder) – and a broad *Externalizing* factor (e.g., alcohol dependence, antisocial personality disorder). In the results reported here, internalizing problems appear to be well captured by high Neuroticism and low Extraversion; externalizing problems are captured by high Extraversion and low Neuroticism and low Agreeableness (and to a lesser extent, low Conscientiousness); and Achenbach’s “severe and diffuse psychopathology” seems to be captured, in part, by high Openness to Experience.

In a separate but related literature, Horowitz (1979) examined the underlying dimensional structure of interpersonal problems people commonly report before beginning psychotherapy. Based on a subset of items derived from videotaped clinical interviews, multidimensional scaling procedures yielded three dimensions: (a) degree of

psychological involvement, (b) nature of involvement (ranging from friendly to hostile), and (c) intention to influence, change, or control another person (ranging from dominance to submissiveness). This research led to an initial version of the *Inventory of Interpersonal Problems* (IIP; Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureño, & Villaseñor, 1988), and later to a circumplex representation of interpersonal problems (IIP-C; Alden, Wiggins, & Pincus, 1990). The eight scales of the IIP-C correspond to the octants of the interpersonal circle (Wiggins, 1979), and are ordered and labeled as follows: Domineering, Vindictive, Cold, Socially Avoidant, Nonassertive, Exploitable, Overly Nurturant, and Intrusive.

### **Future Directions and Limitations**

The generality of the current list of personality problems should be evaluated against other representations of problem behavior, such as the internalizing-externalizing dimension(s) identified by Achenbach and Krueger, the interpersonal “problems” circumplex, as well as diagnostic criteria of Axis II personality disorders (APA, 1994, 2000) and descriptions of self and interpersonal functioning proposed for DSM-5 (APA, 2013; Bender, Morey, Skodol, 2011; Morey et al., 2011). Future research should seek to clarify the structure of these problems and, given their sheer number, examine areas of redundancy. One might expect to find the broad internalizing-externalizing spectra of problem behavior at the highest-order level. But what kinds of subgroupings might exist at lower-order levels, as defined by the problems reported here? Moreover, what dimensions might fall outside the internalizing-externalizing characterization? Is it possible to recover the circumplex representation of interpersonal problems identified by

Alden et al.? What is the relation between the internalizing-externalizing spectra and interpersonal problems? Multivariate solutions to these questions could lead to a set of empirically-based scales for the assessment of personality problems.

Interpretation of the current results should be tempered with the recognition that this study focused exclusively on self-reports of college students. Future research would add to these findings by examining informant ratings of targets' problems, as well as base rates of problem occurrence in other age groups, in both normal and treatment-seeking populations. College students' problems may be similar to those of other populations, but the college years represent a specific time in life that involves its own unique set of developmental issues. Other age groups must confront different life challenges, and new problems (in degree and kind) that may emerge at the cost of not resolving these important life tasks.

## **Conclusion**

The primary contributions of this research are (1) the identification of a broad and inclusive set of personality-related problems and (2) an empirical articulation of problem behaviors associated with all 10 poles of the FFM. People with socially undesirable traits are clearly at risk for experiencing certain kinds of problems, but those with more desirable traits are also at risk, though the nature of their problems appears to be quite different. For example, people at varying levels of Neuroticism experience a range of problems, from emotionally distressing, inward-focused thoughts, feelings, and attitudes (at very high levels), to environmentally destructive, outward-focused behavioral acts directed toward oneself or others (at very low levels). Future research on psychological

processes and core dimensions of personality functioning might help explain how and why these problems are different, and how they might arise, persist over time, and eventually change as individuals continue to develop and mature psychologically.



## References

- Achenbach, T. M. (1966). The classification of children's psychiatric symptoms: A factor-analytic study. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, (No. 615).
- Alden, L. E., Wiggins, J. S., & Pincus, A. L. (1990). Construction of circumplex scales for the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 521-536.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., text rev.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-Humility, the Big Five, and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 227-256.
- Bender, D. S., Morey, L. C., & Skodol, A. E. (2011). Toward a model for assessing level of personality functioning DSM-5, Part 1: A review of theory and methods. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93, 332-346.
- Block, J. (1961). *The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Block, J. (2008). *The Q-sort in character appraisal: Encoding subjective impressions of persons quantitatively*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Block, J. (2010). The five-factor framing of personality and beyond: Some ruminations. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21, 2-25.
- Boudreaux, M. J., Piedmont, R. L., Sherman, M. F., & Ozer, D. J. (2013). Identifying personality-related problems in living: The Multi-Context Problems Checklist. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95, 62-73.
- Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior: "Having" and "doing" in the study of personality and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 45, 735-750.
- Cattell, R. B. (1950). *Personality: A systematic, theoretical, and factual study*. New York: McGraw.
- Clark, L. A. (1993). *Manual for the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Cleckley, H. M. (1976). *The mask of sanity* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cohen, P., Cohen, J., Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1999). The problem of units and the circumstance for POMP. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *34*, 315-346.
- Coker, L. A., Samuel, D. B., & Widiger, T. A. (2002). Maladaptive personality functioning within the Big Five and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *16*, 385-401.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 668-678.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & Widiger, T. A. (Eds.) (2002). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- De Raad, B. & Perugini, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Big Five Assessment*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- De Sena, P. A. (1966). Problems of consistent over-, under-, and normal-achieving college students as identified by the Mooney Problem Check List. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *59*, 351-355.
- Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A self-report symptom inventory. *Behavioral Science*, *19*, 1-15.
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 880-896.
- Edwards, A. L. (1969). Trait and evaluative consistency in self-description. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *29*, 737-752.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.

- Fowles, D. C. (1980). The three arousal model: Implications of Gray's two-factor learning theory for heart rate, electrodermal activity, and psychopathy. *Psychophysiology*, *17*, 87-104.
- Freud, S. (1905/1962). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1982). From ace to zombie: Some explorations in the language of personality. In C. D. Spielberger & J. N. Butcher (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 1, pp. 203-234). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.) *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 84-96.
- Haigler, E. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2001). Experimental manipulation of NEO-PI-R items. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *77*, 339-358.
- Hendriks, A. A. J., Hofstee, W. K. B., & De Raad, B. (1999). The Five-Factor Personality Inventory (FFPI). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *27*, 307-325.
- Hofstee, W. K. B., de Raad, B., & Goldberg, L. R. (1992). Integration of the Big Five and circumplex approaches to trait structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 146-163.
- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *11*, 213-218.
- Hopwood, C. J., Morey, L. C., Ansell, E. B., Grilo, C. M., Sanislow, C. A., McGlashan, T. H., ... Skodol, A. E. (2009). The convergent and discriminant validity of five-factor traits: Current and prospective social, work, and recreational dysfunction. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *23*, 466-476.
- Horney, K. (1945). *Our inner conflicts: A constructive theory of neurosis*. New York: Norton.

- Horowitz, L. M. (1979). On the cognitive structure of interpersonal problems treated in psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47*, 5-15.
- Horowitz, L. M., Rosenberg, S. E., Baer, B. A., Ureño, G. & Villaseñor, V. S. (1988). Inventory of Interpersonal Problems: Psychometric properties and clinical applications. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 885-892.
- John, O. P., Angleitner, A. & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality: A historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality, 2*, 171 – 205.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 1-39.
- Krueger, R. F. (1999). The structure of common mental disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 56*, 921-926.
- Livesley, W. J. (1998). Suggestions for a framework for an empirically based classification of personality disorders. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 43*, 137-147.
- Lucas, R. E., & Baird, B. M. (2004). Extraversion and emotional reactivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 473-485.
- Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McCrae, R. R. (1994). A reformulation of Axis II: Personality and personality-related problems. In P. T. Costa, Jr., & T. A. Widiger (Eds.), *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality* (pp. 303-310). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 139 – 153). New York: The Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2010). *NEO inventories professional manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- McCrae, R. R., Löckenhoff, C., E., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2005). A step toward DSM-V: Cataloging personality related problems in living. *European Journal of Personality, 19*, 269-286.
- Mooney, R. L., & Gordon, L. A. (1950). *The Mooney Problem Check Lists*. New York: Psychological Corporation.

- Morey, L. C., Berghuis, H., Bender, D. S., Verheul, R., Krueger, R. F., & Skodol, A. E. (2011). Toward a model of assessing level of personality functioning in DSM-5, Part II: Empirical articulation of a core dimension of personality pathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 93*, 347-353.
- Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., Jamerson, J. E., Samuel, D. B., Olson, D. R., & Widiger, T. A. (2006). Psychometric properties of an abbreviated instrument of the five-factor model. *Assessment, 13*, 119-137.
- Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., & Widiger, T. A. (2010). Personality-related problems in living: An empirical approach. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*, 230-238.
- Parker, G., Both, L., Olley, A., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Irvine, P., & Jacobs, G. (2002). Defining disordered personality functioning. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 16*, 503-522.
- Parker, G., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Both, L., Kumar, S., Wilhelm, K., & Olley, A. (2004). Measuring disordered personality functioning: To love and to work reprised. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 110*, 230-239.
- Pettersson, E., Mendle, J., Turkheimer, E., Horn, E. E., Ford, D. C., Simms, L. J., & Clark, L. A. (2014). Do maladaptive behaviors exist at one or both ends of personality traits? *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 433-446.
- Pincus, A. L., & Wiggins, J. S. (1992). An expanded perspective on interpersonal assessment. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 71*, 91-94.
- Roberts, B. W., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., & Goldberg, L. R. (2005). The structure of Conscientiousness: An empirical investigation based on seven major personality questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 103-139.
- Rojas, S. L., & Widiger, T. A. (2014). Convergent and discriminant validity of the five factor form. *Assessment, 21*, 143-157.
- Samuel, D. B., Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., & Widiger, T. A. (2013). An investigation of the factor structure and convergent and discriminant validity of the Five Factor Model Rating Form. *Assessment, 20*, 24-35.
- Samuel, D. B., & Widiger, T. A. (2008). A meta-analytic review of the relationships between the five-factor model and *DSM-IV-TR* personality disorders: A facet level analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 1326-1342.

- Saulsman, L. M., & Page, A. C. (2004). The five-factor model and personality disorder empirical literature: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1055-1085.
- Strack, S. (2006). *Differentiating normal and abnormal personality* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Springer.
- Trull, T. J., Jahng, S., Tomko, R. L., Wood, P. K., & Sher, K. J. (2010). Revised NESARC personality disorder diagnoses: Gender, prevalence, and comorbidity with substance dependence disorders. *Journal of personality disorders, 24*, 412-426.
- Trull, T. J., & Widiger, T. A. (1997). *Structured Interview for the Five-Factor Model of Personality (SIFFM): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Westen, D., & Arkowitz-Western, L. (1998). Limitations of Axis II in diagnosing personality pathology in clinical practice. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 155*, 1767-1771.
- Widiger, T. A. (2011). The DSM-5 dimensional model of personality disorder: Rationale and empirical support. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 25*, 222-234.
- Widiger, T. A., Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (2002). A proposal for Axis II: Diagnosing personality disorders using the five-factor model. In P. T. Costa, Jr., & T. A. Widiger (Eds.), *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 431-456). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Widiger, T. A., Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (2012). Diagnosis of personality disorder using the five-factor model and the proposed DSM-5. In T. A. Widiger & P. T. Costa, Jr., (Eds.), *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 285-310). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Widiger, T. A., & Mullins-Sweatt, S. N. (2009). Five-factor model of personality disorder: A proposal for DSM-V. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 5*, 197-220.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1973). *Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 395-412.

Table 1

*Examples of Personality Problems Adapted from the NEO Problems in Living Checklist (NEO-PLC) and California Adult Q-Set (CAQ)*

NEO-PLC and CAQ	Personality Problem
<i>NEO-PLC Item</i>	
Inappropriate suppression of feelings of anger or hostility when confronted with substantial provocation, exploitation, or abuse	Being unable to express anger toward another person; Being unable to stand up to others
Difficulty developing or sustaining personal, intimate relationships	Difficulty developing close and lasting relationships; Being unable to fully connect with others
Preoccupation with unusual, aberrant, or strange ideas; reality testing can be tenuous	Being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas; Believing in things others find bizarre or irrational
Machiavellian behavior; manipulates, cons, or deceives others for personal profit or advantage	Taking advantage of others; Manipulating other people to get what I want; Cheating or stealing from others
Rigid emphasis on proper order and organization that interferes with tasks	Wasting time on details; Having trouble functioning in a disorganized environment
<i>CAQ Item</i>	
Behaves in a giving way toward others	Giving too much to others; Acting selfishly with others (rev.)
Is thin-skinned; sensitive to anything that can be construed as criticism or an interpersonal slight	Getting easily hurt by criticism; Not caring enough about what other people think (rev.)
Tends to be rebellious and non-conforming	Acting too rebellious and non-conforming; Conforming to social norms and expectations too much (rev.)
Emphasizes communication through action and non-verbal behavior	Having trouble understanding facial expressions and gestures of others (rev.)
Values own independence and autonomy	Getting angry when my independence is threatened

Table 2

*Top 10 Highest and Lowest Rated Problems of College Students*

Top 10 Highest Rated Problems	Mean (SD)	Top 10 Lowest Rated Problems	Mean (SD)
Procrastinating too much	1.58 (1.07)	Getting into trouble with the law	0.12 (0.37)
Having poor sleeping habits (e.g., sleeping too much, not sleeping enough)	1.56 (0.97)	Having too many sexual partners	0.15 (0.50)
Worrying too much	1.40 (0.95)	Having a reputation for being untrustworthy	0.16 (0.48)
Feeling tired and having no energy	1.28 (0.96)	Cheating or stealing from others	0.16 (0.48)
Being too concerned by what others think	1.24 (0.92)	Having visual or auditory hallucinations	0.17 (0.45)
Not having good work or study habits	1.24 (0.98)	Cheating on my partner or spouse	0.17 (0.53)
Overanalyzing everything	1.22 (1.01)	Being uninterested in sex	0.17 (0.50)
Second guessing myself too much	1.21 (0.96)	Getting too closely involved with relatives	0.17 (0.45)
Not reaching my full potential	1.21 (1.04)	Engaging in unusual sexual behavior	0.19 (0.52)
Getting easily bored	1.18 (0.88)	Not enjoying sex	0.22 (0.58)

*Note.* Problems rated on a 0 to 3 scale.  $N = 409$ .



Table 3

*Examples of Personality Problems Rated Differently by Men and Women*

Personality Problem	Women <sup>a</sup>	Men <sup>b</sup>	<i>t</i> -test	<i>d</i>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
<i>Problems Rated Higher by Women</i>				
Crying too easily	0.78 (0.93)	0.30 (0.63)	6.02**	0.60
Feeling disgusted about my body	1.05 (1.01)	0.67 (0.84)	4.07**	0.41
Acting awkwardly around others	1.15 (0.79)	0.84 (0.76)	4.06**	0.40
Having mood swings	0.79 (0.85)	0.51 (0.73)	3.52**	0.35
Being easily affected by emotions	0.95 (0.95)	0.70 (0.84)	2.76**	0.27
Panicking too easily	0.88 (0.89)	0.66 (0.77)	2.61**	0.26
Getting easily overwhelmed	0.90 (0.91)	0.68 (0.81)	2.58*	0.26
Falling apart under stress	0.94 (0.94)	0.70 (0.88)	2.58*	0.26
<i>Problems Rated Higher by Men</i>				
Thinking about sex too much	0.49 (0.77)	0.98 (1.01)	-5.51**	-0.55
Having a dark sense of humor	0.38 (0.65)	0.74 (0.83)	-4.84**	-0.48
Being seen as arrogant or conceited	0.33 (0.60)	0.65 (0.76)	-4.67**	-0.47
Feeling sexually unfulfilled	0.44 (0.70)	0.80 (0.99)	-4.31**	-0.43
Being too smart for my own good	0.28 (0.61)	0.60 (0.91)	-4.27**	-0.43
Cheating or stealing from others	0.07 (0.31)	0.27 (0.62)	-4.27**	-0.43
Being insensitive to social rules and customs	0.24 (0.47)	0.48 (0.69)	-4.10**	-0.41
Joking around too much	0.50 (0.69)	0.81 (0.86)	-3.94**	-0.39

Note. Ratings made on a 0 to 3 scale. \*\* $p < .01$ . \* $p < .05$ ; two-tailed. <sup>a</sup> $N = 232$ , <sup>b</sup> $N = 176$ .

Table 4

*Distribution of Correlations of Personality Problems Across the Poles of the Five-Factor Model Trait Domains as Measured by the IPIP NEO-PI-R and EXP NEO-PI-R*

	N		E		O		A		C	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
NEO <sup>a</sup>	278	0	5	127	5	54	1	181	0	258
EXP <sup>b</sup>	79	9	75	8	243	0	165	0	35	10

*Note.* N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness to Experience; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations with a magnitude of at least .15 were counted; correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.

Table 5

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Neuroticism*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Anxiety	<p>Worrying too much (.49); Getting easily overwhelmed (.45); Overreacting to losses, setbacks, or failures (.44); Feeling tense or anxious (.42); Thinking in worst-case scenarios (.41)</p> <p>Having a reputation for being untrustworthy (-.15); Having too many sexual partners (-.13); Cheating or stealing from others (-.11)</p>	<p>Protecting my emotions too much (.25); Shutting down when upset (.25); Feeling that things are outside my control (.22); Worrying too much (.21); Getting overly anxious when speaking in front of groups (.19)</p> <p>Taking too many risks (-.23); Difficulty being serious (-.22); Excessively seeking thrills (-.22); Cheating or stealing from others (-.20); Doing things that can harm my body (e.g., cutting, burning, hitting, scratching) (-.19)</p>
Angry Hostility	<p>Being too quick to anger (.65); Getting easily frustrated (.62); Feeling touchy or irritable (.57); Getting easily upset by small things (.53); Getting easily annoyed by others (.52)</p> <p>Being overly modest about my positive characteristics (-.11)</p>	<p>Getting easily frustrated (.30); Getting angry when my independence is threatened (.24); Getting easily annoyed by others (.24); Getting easily upset by small things (.21); Reacting too quickly to things (.20)</p> <p>Difficulty being serious (-.31); Being overly affectionate with others (-.30); Forgiving people too easily (-.24); Being easily taken advantage of (-.20); Getting too closely involved with relatives (-.18)</p>
Depression	<p>Feeling hopeless or depressed (.66); Being overly pessimistic (e.g., about life, the future, myself) (.64); Feeling useless and ineffective (.63); Feeling dissatisfied with myself (.59); Feeling lonely (.57)</p> <p>No problems</p>	<p>Feeling dissatisfied with my appearance (.40); Feeling like the cause of problems (.39); Thinking poorly of myself (.37); Second guessing myself too much (.35); Feeling that things are outside my control (.35)</p> <p>Cheating or stealing from others (-.25); Confronting people too quickly about problems (-.17); Taking advantage of others (-.16); Cheating on my partner or spouse (-.15); Having a reputation for being untrustworthy (-.14)</p>

Table 5

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Neuroticism (Continued)*

IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Self-Consciousness	
Feeling fearful or nervous in social situations (.50); Acting shy around others (.49); Difficulty expressing my feelings (.48); Feeling like an outsider in most social situations (.45); Feeling disappointed about lack of accomplishments (.45)	Feeling fearful or nervous in social situations (.38); Feeling like an outsider in most social situations (.37); Being overly critical of myself (.35); Being too concerned by what others think (.35); Feeling that others criticize or judge me (.35)
Having a reputation for being untrustworthy (-.10)	Cheating or stealing from others (-.15); Having too many sexual partners (-.15); Taking too many risks (-.14); Talking too much (-.13); Having a reputation for being untrustworthy (-.12)
Impulsiveness	
Difficulty budgeting money (.50); Difficulty resisting temptations (.45); Difficulty managing my time (.38); Being easily affected by emotions (.38); Telling personal things to other people too often (.36)	Difficulty resisting temptations (.24); Acting impatiently when I want something (.24); Procrastinating too much (.23); Feeling guilty about past mistakes (.14); Having trouble getting my priorities in order (.14)
Difficulty opening up to others (-.17)	Lacking a sense of humor (-.23); Having a reputation for being untrustworthy (-.21); Perceiving life as unreal or make-believe (-.19); Having trouble understanding facial expressions and gestures of others (-.18); Being unable to act spontaneously (-.14)
Vulnerability	
Getting easily overwhelmed (.54); Panicking too easily (.49); Being easily affected by emotions (.47); Having mood swings (.46); Giving up too easily (.45)	Being too concerned by what others think (.22); Worrying too much (.21); Getting easily overwhelmed (.21); Overinterpreting mild symptoms as signs of illness (.19); Falling apart under stress (.17)
No problems	Having too many hobbies and interests (-.21); Finding most people uninteresting (-.20); Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.19); Feeling indifferent about loved ones (-.16); Difficulty appreciating art and culture (-.15)

Note. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.

Table 6

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Extraversion*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Warmth	Telling personal things to other people too often (.16); Trusting people too easily (.14); Talking too much (.14)	Getting too attached to others (.41); Talking too much (.39); Being overly affectionate with others (.37); Forgiving people too easily (.33); Being overly protective of loved ones (.30)
	Difficulty developing close and lasting relationships (-.47); Difficulty opening up to others (-.47); Finding most people uninteresting (-.45); Being unable to fully connect with others (-.44); Not supporting others enough (-.41)	Avoiding people or social situations (-.13); Having a cynical attitude (-.10)
Gregariousness	Flirting with others too much (.30); Talking too much (.20); Telling personal things to other people too often (.18); Getting too attached to others (.13); Having trouble spending time alone (.13)	Talking too much (.29); Being overly affectionate with others (.27); Getting too attached to others (.25); Difficulty staying out of other people's business (.25); Doing things just to be noticed (.24)
	Acting shy around others (-.46); Feeling like an outsider in most social situations (-.45); Difficulty making or keeping friends (-.44); Not enjoying the company of others (-.41); Not having much in common with others (-.40)	Difficulty opening up to others (-.19); Avoiding people or social situations (-.19); Having a cynical attitude (-.16); Difficulty trusting people (-.15); Acting shy around others (-.15)
Assertiveness	Bossing around others too much (.16); Acting superior or condescending toward others (.15); Dominating or intimidating others (.13); Being seen as arrogant or conceited (.13); Arguing with people too much (.12)	Being seen as arrogant or conceited (.23); Starting arguments and conflicts with others (.21); Dominating or intimidating others (.19); Bossing around others too much (.17); Arguing with people too much (.15)
	Difficulty taking the lead (-.49); Being unable to stand up to others (-.40); Letting others make decisions too often (-.37); Not holding opinions about things (-.37); Difficulty telling another person what I want (-.34)	Feeling fearful or nervous in social situations (-.35); Feeling like an outsider in most social situations (-.33); Having trouble being self-sufficient (-.31); Difficulty taking the lead (-.30); Thinking poorly of myself (-.29)

Table 6

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Extraversion (Continued)*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Activity		
	Spending too much time working (.24); Needing to do things my way (.20); Needing to keep busy (.13); Reacting too quickly to things (.13); Pushing too hard to excel (.13)	Being hyperactive (.41); Talking too much (.40); Overreacting to losses, setbacks, or failures (.32); Using drugs or alcohol too much (.29); Reacting too quickly to things (.29)
	Not having good work or study habits (-.39); Difficulty prioritizing things I need to do (-.39); Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.32); Difficulty managing my time (-.32); Lacking direction in life (-.32)	Being unable to act spontaneously (-.13); Feeling fearful or nervous in social situations (-.12); Difficulty recognizing social cues (-.12); Avoiding people or social situations (-.12)
Excitement-Seeking		
	Excessively seeking thrills (.36); Having an addiction (e.g., eating, drinking, smoking, spending) (.24); Taking too many risks (.23); Having trouble spending time alone (.18); Acting in ways that I later regret (.18)	Excessively seeking thrills (.34); Flirting with others too much (.27); Getting easily bored (.22); Taking too many risks (.22); Spending too much time and energy in sexual activity (.20)
	Being afraid of trying new things (-.34); Being unable to act spontaneously (-.25); Feeling fearful or nervous in social situations (-.22); Being overly cautious (-.18); Being afraid of taking chances (-.16)	Avoiding people or social situations (-.25); Being afraid of trying new things (-.25); Being unable to act spontaneously (-.24); Being afraid of taking chances (-.19); Difficulty adjusting to change (-.19)
Positive Emotions		
	Talking too much (.19)	Being giddy and overly excitable (.32); Being unrealistically or excessively optimistic (.27); Being hyperactive (.27); Flirting with others too much (.22); Joking around too much (.20)
	Feeling emotionally dull or bland (-.37); Being overly pessimistic (e.g., about life, the future, myself) (-.37); Feeling hopeless or depressed (-.36); Lacking interest or enjoyment in things (-.36); Finding most people uninteresting (-.34)	Having a cynical attitude (-.30); Feeling emotionally dull or bland (-.24); Disliking most people (-.24); Being overly pessimistic (e.g., about life, the future, myself) (-.23); Lacking interest or enjoyment in things (-.20)

Note. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.

Table 7

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Openness to Experience*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Fantasy	Getting lost in fantasy (.33); Having an overactive imagination (.32); Living in a dream world (.25); Feeling misunderstood by others (.21); Being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas (.21)	Getting lost in fantasy (.53); Having trouble being self-sufficient (.43); Living in a dream world (.39); Feeling disconnected from my immediate experiences (.36); Having an overactive imagination (.36)
	Feeling touchy or irritable (-.26); Getting easily annoyed by others (-.25); Lacking curiosity about things (-.22); Lacking in emotional depth (-.22); Being unable to act spontaneously (-.21)	Difficulty appreciating art and culture (-.13)
Aesthetics	Underestimating my abilities and skills (.16); Having chronic pain, headaches, or stomach discomfort (.14); Being easily affected by emotions (.13); Being overly critical of myself (.10); Needing to keep busy (.10)	Getting lost in fantasy (.40); Feeling stuck or stifled by society's rules and expectations (.24); Feeling that best efforts are never good enough (.23); Feeling misunderstood by others (.22); Living in a dream world (.21)
	Difficulty appreciating art and culture (-.40); Being afraid of trying new things (-.34); Not having any hobbies or interests (-.29); Lacking in emotional depth (-.29); Lacking respect for people's attitudes and opinions (-.28)	Difficulty appreciating art and culture (-.24); Lacking interest or enjoyment in things (-.16); Letting logic and reason dominate my emotions (-.14); Not having any hobbies or interests (-.11); Being unable to see my own faults (-.11)
Feelings	Being easily affected by emotions (.45); Getting too attached to others (.37); Crying too easily (.30); Letting my emotions interfere with important decisions (.28); Overanalyzing everything (.27)	Being easily affected by emotions (.49); Letting my emotions interfere with important decisions (.47); Feeling abandoned by family or friends (.45); Feeling hopeless or depressed (.45); Getting easily hurt by criticism (.44)
	Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.32); Not supporting others enough (-.25); Taking advantage of others (-.24); Lacking in emotional depth (-.22); Getting easily bored (-.22)	No problems

Table 7

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Openness to Experience (Continued)*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Actions		
No problems		Taking too many risks (.27); Excessively seeking thrills (.23); Doing things that can harm my body (e.g., cutting, burning, hitting, scratching) (.22); Being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas (.18); Overestimating my abilities and skills (.17)
Being afraid of trying new things (-.48); Lacking respect for people's attitudes and opinions (-.36); Difficulty adjusting to change (-.34); Being too picky or fussy (-.32); Being unable to act spontaneously (-.31)		Being unable to act spontaneously (-.22); Being afraid of trying new things (-.19); Being overly cautious (-.16); Difficulty adjusting to change (-.16); Making overly rigid or moralistic judgments of others (-.16)
Ideas		
Being too smart for my own good (.21); Having an overactive imagination (.14); Pushing too hard to excel (.09); Being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas (.07); Being seen as arrogant or conceited (.06)		Behaving in a manner others think is strange or unusual (.27); Spending too much time on hobbies (.26); Feeling stuck or stifled by society's rules and expectations (.25); Difficulty recognizing social cues (.23); Not pursuing what I want most in life (.22)
Envy other people too much (-.31); Giving up too easily (-.29); Failing to face my problems directly (-.27); Having trouble finding creative solutions to problems (-.27); Difficulty verbalizing thoughts and ideas (-.25)		No problems
Values		
Thinking poorly of myself (.25); Lacking direction in life (.25); Not having a meaningful life philosophy (.22); Not having a belief system to guide my life (.21); Feeling a lack of meaning in life (.20)		Lacking direction in life (.27); Not having a belief system to guide my life (.26); Getting into trouble with the law (.25); Believing in things others find bizarre or irrational (.24); Being unable to control myself (.23)
Needing to do things my way (-.15); Having trouble accepting things I don't agree with (-.14); Needing to be in control (-.13); Feeling deserving of special treatment (-.13); Being afraid of trying new things (-.11)		Having a cynical attitude (-.15); Making overly rigid or moralistic judgments of others (-.11)

Note. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.



Table 8

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Agreeableness*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Trust		
	Trusting people too easily (.16)	Being overly affectionate with others (.33); Trusting people too easily (.29); Getting too attached to others (.28); Being unrealistically or excessively optimistic (.28); Forgiving people too easily (.27)
	Difficulty trusting people (-.53); Being unable to rely on others (-.43); Having a cynical attitude (-.39); Difficulty opening up to others (-.38); Disliking most people (-.37)	Having a cynical attitude (-.28); Protecting my emotions too much (-.17); Disliking most people (-.16); Difficulty showing love and affection to others (-.14); Difficulty opening up to others (-.14)
Straightforwardness		
	No problems	Difficulty understanding things (.16); Difficulty assigning tasks and responsibilities to others (.15); Lacking curiosity about things (.12); Being unable to relax (.12); Being unable to express anger toward another person (.12)
	Taking advantage of others (-.42); Cheating or stealing from others (-.41); Being seen as arrogant or conceited (-.38); Feeling deserving of special treatment (-.37); Criticizing or judging others (-.35)	Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.24); Needing to be right (-.22); Criticizing or judging others (-.22); Taking advantage of others (-.22); Acting superior or condescending toward others (-.20)
Altruism		
	Being easily taken advantage of (.17); Putting other people's needs before my own (.16); Giving too much to others (.13); Being easily affected by emotions (.12); Being unable to say "no" (.11)	Forgiving people too easily (.34); Being easily taken advantage of (.32); Giving too much to others (.32); Letting other people boss me around (.27); Being unable to express anger toward another person (.26)
	Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.46); Not supporting others enough (-.45); Taking advantage of others (-.41); Arguing with people too much (-.40); Acting selfishly with others (-.40)	Having a cynical attitude (-.19); Criticizing or judging others (-.16); Getting easily annoyed by others (-.11); Refusing to forgive and forget (-.11)

Table 8

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Agreeableness (Continued)*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Compliance	Being easily taken advantage of (.16); Being unable to stand up to others (.15); Being unable to say “no” (.13); Putting other people’s needs before my own (.11)	Having trouble planning for the future (.29); Having trouble getting my priorities in order (.27); Not following through with commitments (.26); Having trouble putting strategies in place to achieve my goals (.25); Being easily influenced by others (.25)
	Acting impatiently when I want something (-.44); Being too quick to anger (-.43); Starting arguments and conflicts with others (-.42); Criticizing or judging others (-.40); Acting aggressively toward others (-.39)	Getting easily annoyed by others (-.17); Being honest in ways that is sometimes hurtful to others (-.17); Bossing around others too much (-.13); Lacking respect for people’s attitudes and opinions (-.12); Making overly rigid or moralistic judgments of others (-.12)
Modesty	Feeling disappointed about lack of accomplishments (.30); Not knowing what to do with my life (.29); Feeling that best efforts are never good enough (.26); Thinking poorly of myself (.26); Underestimating my abilities and skills (.25)	Being preoccupied with negative thoughts about myself (.56); Feeling like the cause of problems (.52); Feeling useless and ineffective (.52); Thinking poorly of myself (.50); Feeling lonely (.50)
	Feeling deserving of special treatment (-.33); Being seen as arrogant or conceited (-.32); Acting superior or condescending toward others (-.24); Being too smart for my own good (-.22); Exaggerating so that other people will respect me (-.22)	Being seen as arrogant or conceited (-.10)
Tender-Mindedness	Being easily taken advantage of (.23); Giving too much to others (.20); Putting other people’s needs before my own (.19); Being unable to say “no” (.18); Forgiving people too easily (.15)	Being overly protective of loved ones (.24); Forgiving people too easily (.24); Getting too attached to others (.23); Being unable to express anger toward another person (.21); Being easily taken advantage of (.18)
	Arguing with people too much (-.34); Being seen as arrogant or conceited (-.29); Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.28); Taking advantage of others (-.26); Verbally or physically abusing others (-.26)	Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others (-.17); Refusing to forgive and forget (-.13); Letting logic and reason dominate my emotions (-.12); Finding most people uninteresting (-.11)

Note. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.

Table 9

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Conscientiousness*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
Competence		
No problems		Refusing to forgive and forget (.34); Letting logic and reason dominate my emotions (.34); Expecting too much out of people (.30); Needing to do things my way (.29); Getting angry when my independence is threatened (.28)
Having trouble putting strategies in place to achieve my goals (-.46); Giving up too easily (-.43); Easily losing interest in assigned tasks (-.39); Lacking willpower or self-discipline (-.38); Feeling useless and ineffective (-.38)		Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.16); Not having good work or study habits (-.15); Having trouble planning for the future (-.12); Difficulty prioritizing things I need to do (-.12); Not having any long-term plans (-.10)
Order		
Being preoccupied with cleanliness (.19); Being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization (.19); Needing to do things my way (.16); Needing to do things perfectly (.15); Having trouble functioning in a disorganized environment (.10)		Being preoccupied with cleanliness (.35); Needing to do things perfectly (.21); Being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization (.18); Having trouble breaking the same routine (.17); Being unable to work without clear rules and guidelines (.13)
Being disorganized (-.52); Joking around too much (-.28); Not having a belief system to guide my life (-.27); Changing my plans and interests too often (-.26); Difficulty following directions (.26)		Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.29); Being disorganized (-.20); Procrastinating too much (-.17); Not having good work or study habits (-.17); Having trouble planning for the future (-.15)
Dutifulness		
No problems		Denying myself pleasure in life (.24); Feeling cheated, victimized, or abused by others (.24); Acting too competitively (.23); Being unable to rely on others (.23); Spending too much time working (.22)
Cheating or stealing from others (-.48); Not following through with commitments (-.37); Being insensitive to social rules and customs (-.34); Depending on other people too much (-.33); Being undependable or irresponsible (-.33)		Procrastinating too much (-.20); Not having good work or study habits (-.14); Being disorganized (-.14); Difficulty managing my time (-.11); Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.11)

Table 9

*Examples of Personality Problems Associated with the Facets of Conscientiousness (Continued)*

	IPIP NEO-PI-R <sup>a</sup>	EXP NEO-PI-R <sup>b</sup>
	<b>Achievement Striving</b>	
	Pushing too hard to excel (.19); Spending too much time working (.11); Needing to do things perfectly (.10); Needing to do things my way (.10)	Pushing too hard to excel (.23); Being unable to rely on others (.20); Having trouble accepting loss or failure (.19); Needing to do things perfectly (.17); Spending too much time working (.15)
	Not having good work or study habits (-.45); Easily losing interest in assigned tasks (-.44); Lacking direction in life (-.44); Not having any long-term plans (-.43); Lacking ambition or motivational drive (-.42)	Lacking ambition or motivational drive (-.35); Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.33); Not having any long-term plans (-.31); Lacking direction in life (-.30); Having trouble being self-sufficient (-.25)
	<b>Self-Discipline</b>	
	Being preoccupied with cleanliness (.12); Being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization (.10)	Spending too much time working (.14); Being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization (.13)
59	Having trouble getting started on things (-.54); Difficulty prioritizing things I need to do (-.52); Easily losing interest in assigned tasks (-.49); Getting easily distracted (-.49); Difficulty balancing work and leisure (-.45);	Having trouble getting my priorities in order (-.35); Not having good work or study habits (-.34); Having trouble getting started on things (-.33); Having trouble putting strategies in place to achieve my goals (-.29); Lacking willpower or self-discipline (-.28)
	<b>Deliberation</b>	
	No problems	Being unable to act spontaneously (.31); Being afraid of trying new things (.28); Being afraid of taking chances (.27); Having trouble making even minor decisions (.26); Difficult dealing with life transitions (.23)
	Making hasty or careless decisions (-.51); Getting easily distracted (-.46); Excessively seeking thrills (-.43); Acting in ways that I later regret (-.43); Getting easily bored (-.41)	Being seen as arrogant or conceited (-.19); Joking around too much (-.15); Thinking about sex too much (-.11); Taking too many risks (-.11); Acting too rebellious and non-conforming (-.11)

Note. <sup>a</sup>N = 184; <sup>b</sup>N = 183. Correlations  $\geq .15$  are significant at the  $p < .05$  level; two-tailed.

*Appendix*

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
1	Acting awkwardly around others	1.15	0.79	0.84	0.76	4.06**	0.40	1.02	0.79	0.35	-0.46
2	Lacking a sense of humor	0.40	0.65	0.39	0.68	0.07	0.01	0.40	0.66	1.62	2.07
3	Difficulty verbalizing thoughts and ideas	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.82	-0.05	0.00	0.91	0.82	0.57	-0.35
4	Being too quick to anger	0.78	0.82	0.72	0.85	0.77	0.08	0.75	0.83	0.82	-0.17
5	Taking too many risks	0.60	0.69	0.71	0.81	-1.50	-0.15	0.65	0.75	0.85	-0.10
6	Having an overactive imagination	0.80	0.88	0.97	0.98	-1.89	-0.19	0.88	0.93	0.71	-0.53
7	Difficulty setting limits with people	0.73	0.80	0.81	0.82	-0.99	-0.10	0.77	0.81	0.75	-0.21
8	Flirting with others too much	0.43	0.71	0.63	0.85	-2.60**	-0.26	0.52	0.77	1.46	1.48
9	Being overly affectionate with others	0.43	0.72	0.59	0.74	-2.26*	-0.22	0.50	0.73	1.45	1.63
10	Difficulty being serious	0.44	0.65	0.55	0.71	-1.59	-0.16	0.49	0.68	1.19	0.73
11	Failing to face my problems directly	0.94	0.84	0.99	0.92	-0.61	-0.06	0.96	0.88	0.55	-0.54
12	Lacking curiosity about things	0.39	0.61	0.45	0.70	-0.96	-0.10	0.42	0.65	1.39	1.16
13	Feeling emotionally dull or bland	0.71	0.83	0.83	0.87	-1.40	-0.14	0.76	0.85	0.89	0.02
14	Needing to be in control	0.91	0.89	0.77	0.84	1.62	0.16	0.86	0.87	0.73	-0.30
15	Getting easily bored	1.07	0.88	1.31	0.88	-2.66**	-0.27	1.18	0.88	0.31	-0.66
16	Feeling uncomfortable with intimacy	0.69	0.84	0.61	0.81	0.92	0.09	0.66	0.83	1.16	0.68
17	Criticizing or judging others	0.86	0.82	0.91	0.83	-0.62	-0.06	0.88	0.82	0.60	-0.34
18	Getting lost in fantasy	0.75	0.89	0.84	0.92	-1.05	-0.10	0.78	0.91	0.91	-0.12
19	Finding fault with things	0.91	0.80	0.95	0.88	-0.47	-0.05	0.93	0.83	0.62	-0.21
20	Believing in things others find bizarre or irrational	0.46	0.68	0.56	0.71	-1.38	-0.14	0.50	0.69	1.21	0.79
21	Not having any hobbies or interests	0.46	0.75	0.49	0.75	-0.42	-0.04	0.47	0.75	1.41	0.97
22	Feeling sexually unsatisfied	0.44	0.70	0.80	0.99	-4.31**	-0.43	0.59	0.85	1.27	0.61
23	Overestimating my abilities and skills	0.62	0.76	0.73	0.80	-1.38	-0.14	0.67	0.78	0.90	0.03
24	Feeling tired and having no energy	1.36	0.93	1.18	0.99	1.84	0.18	1.28	0.96	0.24	-0.89
25	Being preoccupied with cleanliness	0.65	0.83	0.56	0.71	1.20	0.12	0.61	0.78	1.07	0.34
26	Easily losing interest in assigned tasks	0.97	0.82	1.09	0.88	-1.48	-0.15	1.02	0.85	0.54	-0.29
27	Putting other people's needs before my own	1.13	0.93	1.02	0.92	1.17	0.12	1.08	0.93	0.48	-0.65
28	Having few or no friends	0.52	0.83	0.38	0.67	1.84	0.18	0.46	0.77	1.61	1.80
29	Feeling that others criticize or judge me	1.08	0.93	1.02	0.85	0.66	0.07	1.06	0.90	0.53	-0.48
30	Hesitating too much	1.08	0.85	1.19	0.83	-1.32	-0.13	1.13	0.84	0.34	-0.50

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
31	Having poor sleeping habits (e.g., sleeping too much, not sleeping enough)	1.59	0.95	1.52	1.00	0.70	0.07	1.56	0.97	-0.07	-0.98
32	Feeling uncomfortable around the opposite sex	0.44	0.72	0.53	0.77	-1.21	-0.12	0.48	0.74	1.49	1.57
33	Feeling nervous or fearful in social situations	0.82	0.85	0.88	0.88	-0.65	-0.06	0.84	0.86	0.70	-0.37
34	Wasting time on details	0.84	0.81	0.75	0.80	1.18	0.12	0.81	0.81	0.76	-0.01
35	Getting too attached to others	0.98	1.02	0.82	0.87	1.66	0.17	0.91	0.96	0.71	-0.56
36	Difficulty working with others	0.43	0.61	0.45	0.67	-0.37	-0.04	0.44	0.63	1.30	1.35
37	Overreacting to minor frustrations	0.78	0.82	0.74	0.85	0.48	0.05	0.77	0.83	0.78	-0.25
38	Taking advantage of others	0.23	0.53	0.42	0.67	-3.15**	-0.31	0.31	0.60	2.04	4.07
39	Letting logic and reason dominate my emotions	0.69	0.74	0.88	0.88	-2.32*	-0.23	0.78	0.81	0.79	-0.03
40	Being unable to control myself	0.46	0.70	0.52	0.76	-0.83	-0.08	0.48	0.72	1.31	0.73
41	Being troubled by uncertainty	1.02	0.87	1.09	0.95	-0.70	-0.07	1.05	0.90	0.59	-0.40
42	Getting easily annoyed by others	1.11	0.87	0.96	0.83	1.78	0.18	1.05	0.86	0.53	-0.32
43	Being seen as arrogant or conceited	0.33	0.60	0.65	0.76	-4.67**	-0.47	0.47	0.70	1.41	1.53
44	Being unable to act spontaneously	0.63	0.76	0.68	0.85	-0.71	-0.07	0.65	0.80	1.09	0.54
45	Being undependable or irresponsible	0.38	0.70	0.51	0.74	-1.76	-0.18	0.43	0.72	1.65	2.11
46	Worrying too much	1.50	0.94	1.26	0.96	2.51**	0.25	1.40	0.95	0.14	-0.91
47	Having trouble accepting loss or failure	1.17	0.96	1.09	0.95	0.91	0.09	1.14	0.96	0.46	-0.73
48	Having trouble keeping up with changing priorities	0.93	0.85	0.91	0.83	0.19	0.02	0.93	0.84	0.61	-0.26
49	Difficulty budgeting money	0.91	0.92	0.80	0.89	1.25	0.13	0.86	0.91	0.78	-0.30
50	Excessively seeking thrills	0.44	0.62	0.64	0.82	-2.83**	-0.28	0.53	0.73	1.29	1.16
51	Exaggerating so that other people will respect me	0.41	0.65	0.54	0.72	-1.91	-0.19	0.47	0.69	1.29	0.84
52	Thinking in worst-case scenarios	1.19	0.94	1.09	0.96	1.15	0.11	1.15	0.95	0.44	-0.72
53	Feeling abandoned by family or friends	0.75	0.92	0.57	0.80	2.02*	0.20	0.67	0.87	1.17	0.52
54	Being too smart for my own good	0.28	0.61	0.60	0.91	-4.27**	-0.43	0.42	0.77	1.98	3.36
55	Being preoccupied with strange or unusual ideas	0.50	0.74	0.75	0.85	-3.11**	-0.31	0.61	0.80	1.26	1.03
56	Making hasty or careless decisions	0.53	0.71	0.76	0.80	-3.02**	-0.30	0.63	0.76	1.06	0.65
57	Verbally or physically abusing others	0.22	0.53	0.39	0.70	-2.80**	-0.28	0.29	0.61	2.22	4.51
58	Feeling upset for being average and not the best	1.14	0.99	1.09	0.96	0.52	0.05	1.12	0.98	0.44	-0.84
59	Being unable to rely on others	0.92	0.91	0.78	0.86	1.63	0.16	0.86	0.89	0.80	-0.16

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
60	Having an addiction (e.g., eating, drinking, smoking, spending)	0.29	0.64	0.57	0.89	-3.69**	-0.37	0.41	0.77	1.87	2.63
61	Having trouble finding creative solutions to problems	0.61	0.78	0.61	0.75	-0.08	-0.01	0.61	0.76	1.09	0.56
62	Making others feel responsible for my well-being	0.30	0.64	0.35	0.67	-0.84	-0.08	0.32	0.65	2.19	4.53
63	Acting aggressively toward others	0.26	0.52	0.36	0.64	-1.72	-0.17	0.30	0.58	2.07	4.59
64	Having a job with no future	0.51	0.87	0.59	0.97	-0.85	-0.08	0.55	0.92	1.55	1.19
65	Feeling frustrated with schedules	0.94	0.80	0.91	0.90	0.36	0.04	0.93	0.85	0.61	-0.30
66	Being unable to get out of troubling relationships	0.49	0.79	0.58	0.90	-1.05	-0.10	0.53	0.84	1.53	1.42
67	Needing to do things my way	0.86	0.84	0.85	0.87	0.12	0.01	0.86	0.85	0.63	-0.47
68	Letting my emotions interfere with important decisions	0.99	0.90	0.89	0.90	1.17	0.12	0.95	0.90	0.69	-0.30
69	Having a reputation for being untrustworthy	0.11	0.39	0.22	0.57	-2.31*	-0.23	0.16	0.48	3.44	12.82
70	Having poor eating habits (e.g., eating too much, not eating enough)	1.00	0.87	0.89	0.95	1.19	0.12	0.96	0.91	0.62	-0.48
71	Feeling like an outsider in most social situations	0.82	0.88	0.84	0.95	-0.19	-0.02	0.83	0.91	0.84	-0.22
72	Crying too easily	0.78	0.93	0.30	0.63	6.02**	0.60	0.58	0.85	1.41	1.16
73	Protecting my emotions too much	1.16	0.99	1.09	1.00	0.70	0.07	1.12	0.99	0.42	-0.92
74	Getting easily upset by small things	0.85	0.86	0.65	0.77	2.43*	0.24	0.77	0.83	0.87	0.08
75	Giving up too easily	0.72	0.81	0.70	0.85	0.18	0.02	0.71	0.82	1.07	0.63
76	Being honest in ways that is sometimes hurtful to others	0.70	0.83	0.85	0.84	-1.85	-0.18	0.77	0.84	0.86	-0.01
77	Having unrealistic expectations of myself	0.84	0.92	0.79	0.89	0.56	0.06	0.82	0.91	0.88	-0.14
78	Imposing my opinions and beliefs on others	0.35	0.59	0.48	0.70	-2.09*	-0.21	0.41	0.65	1.64	2.73
79	Being too concerned by what others think	1.28	0.92	1.19	0.93	0.96	0.10	1.24	0.92	0.32	-0.73
80	Not holding opinions about things	0.63	0.76	0.65	0.70	-0.33	-0.03	0.64	0.73	0.90	0.22
81	Not having much in common with others	0.55	0.76	0.68	0.87	-1.59	-0.16	0.61	0.81	1.28	0.98
82	Feeling dissatisfied with myself	1.16	0.99	1.06	0.96	0.95	0.09	1.11	0.97	0.49	-0.77
83	Being overly cautious	0.91	0.90	0.95	0.81	-0.47	-0.05	0.93	0.86	0.61	-0.37
84	Feeling indifferent about losses, setbacks, or failures	0.64	0.82	0.79	0.85	-1.78	-0.18	0.71	0.83	1.00	0.28
85	Being disorganized	0.72	0.80	0.94	0.80	-2.77**	-0.28	0.81	0.81	0.70	-0.23
86	Being preoccupied with negative thoughts about myself	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.92	-0.16	-0.02	0.96	0.94	0.62	-0.60
87	Difficulty opening up to others	1.09	1.03	1.06	0.95	0.34	0.03	1.08	1.00	0.53	-0.81



Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
88	Neglecting important details	0.48	0.68	0.68	0.70	-2.81**	-0.28	0.57	0.69	1.00	0.41
89	Feeling hopeless or depressed	0.84	0.93	0.85	0.99	-0.02	0.00	0.85	0.96	0.84	-0.39
90	Having trouble putting strategies in place to achieve my goals	0.78	0.81	0.90	0.87	-1.52	-0.15	0.83	0.84	0.75	-0.14
91	Difficulty trusting people	1.06	1.00	0.91	0.86	1.61	0.16	1.00	0.94	0.57	-0.67
92	Misperceiving the behavior of others	0.82	0.82	0.88	0.81	-0.69	-0.07	0.85	0.82	0.75	0.03
93	Being hyperactive	0.41	0.68	0.44	0.71	-0.34	-0.03	0.43	0.70	1.59	1.95
94	Difficulty following directions	0.31	0.56	0.48	0.69	-2.77**	-0.28	0.38	0.62	1.66	2.62
95	Depending on other people too much	0.57	0.82	0.56	0.75	0.08	0.01	0.57	0.79	1.26	0.85
96	Feeling weak and insecure around dominant others	0.89	0.91	0.81	0.99	0.80	0.08	0.86	0.95	0.89	-0.18
97	Changing my plans and interests too often	0.63	0.78	0.66	0.83	-0.39	-0.04	0.65	0.80	1.04	0.33
98	Lacking willpower or self-discipline	0.76	0.88	0.84	0.91	-0.92	-0.09	0.79	0.89	0.87	-0.16
99	Making overly rigid or moralistic judgments of others	0.52	0.70	0.63	0.75	-1.49	-0.15	0.56	0.73	1.19	1.02
100	Trusting people too easily	0.73	0.87	0.68	0.82	0.67	0.07	0.71	0.86	1.03	0.27
101	Trying to solve other people's problems too often	0.72	0.84	0.68	0.77	0.59	0.06	0.71	0.81	0.94	0.18
102	Having a cynical attitude	0.53	0.78	0.61	0.83	-0.97	-0.10	0.56	0.80	1.33	0.98
103	Being unable to express anger toward another person	0.56	0.82	0.63	0.82	-0.86	-0.09	0.59	0.82	1.24	0.65
104	Being unable to let things go	1.12	0.95	1.02	0.96	1.04	0.10	1.07	0.96	0.53	-0.68
105	Thinking about ending my life	0.29	0.68	0.36	0.73	-1.07	-0.11	0.32	0.70	2.42	5.48
106	Envyng other people too much	0.74	0.89	0.71	0.86	0.31	0.03	0.72	0.87	1.03	0.21
107	Difficulty balancing work and leisure	1.00	0.92	1.18	0.97	-1.97*	-0.20	1.08	0.95	0.45	-0.77
108	Needing to do things perfectly	0.93	0.95	0.87	0.90	0.62	0.06	0.91	0.93	0.77	-0.33
109	Not being challenged enough at work or school	0.45	0.66	0.68	0.86	-3.11**	-0.31	0.55	0.76	1.29	1.05
110	Not following through with commitments	0.54	0.74	0.66	0.81	-1.64	-0.16	0.60	0.77	1.16	0.67
111	Having trouble spending time alone	0.53	0.81	0.51	0.77	0.31	0.03	0.52	0.79	1.53	1.70
112	Feeling lonely	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.99	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.95	0.75	-0.43
113	Not having good work or study habits	1.19	0.97	1.29	1.00	-0.97	-0.10	1.24	0.98	0.35	-0.88
114	Joking around too much	0.50	0.69	0.81	0.86	-3.94**	-0.39	0.64	0.78	1.08	0.55
115	Having trouble holding down a job	0.18	0.52	0.31	0.67	-2.13*	-0.21	0.23	0.59	2.93	8.90
116	Not knowing what to do with my life	1.03	1.06	1.05	1.05	-0.19	-0.02	1.03	1.05	0.66	-0.80

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
117	Having unwanted or repetitive thoughts	0.82	0.92	0.86	0.92	-0.38	-0.04	0.84	0.92	0.85	-0.21
118	Behaving in a manner others think is strange or unusual	0.49	0.71	0.66	0.81	-2.23*	-0.22	0.56	0.76	1.30	1.24
119	Others failing to recognize my contributions	0.70	0.79	0.76	0.86	-0.72	-0.07	0.73	0.81	0.89	0.07
120	Having trouble understanding people's attitudes and opinions	0.39	0.61	0.61	0.80	-3.10**	-0.31	0.49	0.70	1.40	1.58
121	Thinking about sex too much	0.49	0.77	0.98	1.01	-5.51**	-0.55	0.70	0.91	1.07	0.07
122	Difficulty keeping secrets	0.26	0.54	0.30	0.61	-0.67	-0.07	0.28	0.57	2.09	4.02
123	Letting other people boss me around	0.51	0.74	0.44	0.68	0.97	0.10	0.48	0.72	1.38	1.22
124	Falling apart under stress	0.94	0.94	0.70	0.88	2.58*	0.26	0.84	0.93	0.86	-0.22
125	Having visual or auditory hallucinations	0.13	0.40	0.22	0.50	-2.03*	-0.20	0.17	0.45	2.94	9.06
126	Others having too much control in my life	0.47	0.71	0.44	0.75	0.51	0.05	0.46	0.72	1.62	2.28
127	Getting angry when my independence is threatened	0.75	0.90	0.68	0.80	0.80	0.08	0.72	0.85	1.07	0.43
128	Being jealous or possessive of my partner or spouse	0.44	0.74	0.38	0.64	0.99	0.10	0.41	0.70	1.74	2.64
129	Expecting too much out of people	0.73	0.83	0.70	0.82	0.41	0.04	0.72	0.82	0.83	-0.28
130	Difficulty recognizing social cues	0.31	0.61	0.54	0.72	-3.40**	-0.34	0.41	0.67	1.71	2.78
131	Having trouble planning for the future	0.86	0.95	0.92	0.97	-0.65	-0.07	0.88	0.96	0.74	-0.56
132	Doing things just to be noticed	0.41	0.68	0.57	0.75	-2.30*	-0.23	0.48	0.72	1.55	2.18
133	Lacking ambition or motivational drive	0.69	0.91	0.82	0.91	-1.41	-0.14	0.74	0.91	1.08	0.26
134	Being unable to stand up to others	0.67	0.88	0.64	0.82	0.42	0.04	0.66	0.85	1.20	0.67
135	Acting too rebellious and non-conforming	0.30	0.53	0.41	0.70	-1.94	-0.19	0.35	0.61	1.82	3.30
136	Having too many unpaid debts	0.20	0.57	0.29	0.62	-1.48	-0.15	0.24	0.59	2.74	7.56
137	Cheating on my partner or spouse	0.11	0.45	0.24	0.63	-2.57*	-0.26	0.17	0.53	3.70	14.23
138	Having too many hobbies and interests	0.26	0.58	0.43	0.68	-2.60**	-0.26	0.33	0.63	2.12	4.65
139	Having trouble accepting changes in others	0.58	0.74	0.55	0.75	0.36	0.04	0.56	0.74	1.22	1.03
140	Being stingy with money	0.49	0.65	0.62	0.89	-1.67	-0.17	0.55	0.77	1.40	1.54
141	Difficulty assigning tasks and responsibilities to others	0.56	0.74	0.51	0.64	0.76	0.08	0.54	0.70	1.08	0.50
142	Being easily influenced by others	0.66	0.81	0.72	0.79	-0.77	-0.08	0.69	0.80	0.94	0.13
143	Not knowing who I really am	0.73	0.91	0.91	1.04	-1.92	-0.19	0.81	0.97	0.99	-0.12
144	Needing to keep busy	0.74	0.88	0.72	0.86	0.29	0.03	0.73	0.87	0.94	-0.09
145	Trying to please others too much	1.04	0.92	1.06	0.96	-0.15	-0.01	1.05	0.94	0.52	-0.66

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
146	Having too many sexual partners	0.08	0.36	0.24	0.62	-3.27**	-0.33	0.15	0.50	3.87	15.69
147	Being preoccupied with order, rules, schedules, and organization	0.58	0.77	0.65	0.79	-0.90	-0.09	0.61	0.78	1.08	0.41
148	Acting overly submissive with others	0.42	0.67	0.50	0.76	-1.10	-0.11	0.46	0.71	1.64	2.56
149	Being overly pessimistic (e.g., about life, the future, myself)	0.66	0.87	0.81	0.95	-1.73	-0.17	0.72	0.91	1.09	0.21
150	Feeling useless and ineffective	0.68	0.88	0.69	0.88	-0.19	-0.02	0.68	0.88	1.15	0.43
151	Perceiving life as unreal or make-believe	0.24	0.57	0.33	0.62	-1.56	-0.16	0.28	0.59	2.37	5.72
152	Denying myself pleasure in life	0.33	0.64	0.50	0.71	-2.52*	-0.25	0.40	0.67	1.74	2.84
153	Needing too much reassurance from others	0.73	0.85	0.70	0.80	0.34	0.03	0.72	0.83	0.98	0.29
154	Shutting down when upset	0.87	0.93	0.70	0.93	1.78	0.18	0.80	0.93	0.99	0.03
155	Confronting people too quickly about problems	0.34	0.68	0.47	0.68	-1.85	-0.18	0.40	0.68	1.82	3.16
156	Being unable to see my own faults	0.50	0.64	0.66	0.77	-2.33*	-0.23	0.57	0.70	1.01	0.34
157	Refusing to forgive and forget	0.79	0.87	0.73	0.80	0.73	0.07	0.76	0.84	0.95	0.29
158	Panicking too easily	0.88	0.89	0.66	0.77	2.61**	0.26	0.79	0.85	0.85	0.01
159	Being depended upon by others to do too much	0.74	0.81	0.65	0.76	1.06	0.11	0.70	0.79	0.91	0.20
160	Lying too much	0.40	0.68	0.67	0.80	-3.74**	-0.37	0.51	0.74	1.28	0.76
161	Having stormy relationships with others	0.30	0.63	0.36	0.67	-0.96	-0.10	0.33	0.65	2.13	4.42
162	Being unable to enjoy sex	0.20	0.56	0.25	0.60	-0.82	-0.08	0.22	0.58	2.96	9.10
163	Doing things that defeat my own goals	0.50	0.71	0.68	0.78	-2.38**	-0.24	0.58	0.75	1.14	0.71
164	Acting impatiently when I want something	0.83	0.87	0.82	0.81	0.04	0.00	0.83	0.84	0.75	-0.17
165	Feeling disconnected from my immediate experiences	0.69	0.79	0.69	0.87	-0.04	0.00	0.69	0.82	0.97	0.14
166	Being unable to relax	0.69	0.85	0.66	0.82	0.30	0.03	0.68	0.84	1.01	0.15
167	Difficulty appreciating art and culture	0.34	0.65	0.49	0.73	-2.24*	-0.22	0.41	0.69	1.69	2.27
168	Lacking interest or enjoyment in things	0.36	0.65	0.52	0.78	-2.33*	-0.23	0.43	0.71	1.75	2.77
169	Feeling a lack of meaning in life	0.55	0.86	0.63	0.90	-0.89	-0.09	0.58	0.87	1.48	1.31
170	Difficulty speaking in front of groups	0.96	0.99	1.06	1.01	-1.00	-0.10	1.00	1.00	0.60	-0.80
171	Acting shy around others	0.93	0.86	0.95	0.93	-0.25	-0.02	0.94	0.89	0.69	-0.27
172	Being easily taken advantage of	0.66	0.81	0.63	0.80	0.37	0.04	0.64	0.80	1.10	0.53
173	Having morals, values, or beliefs that conflict with others	0.47	0.70	0.61	0.73	-1.87	-0.19	0.54	0.72	1.16	0.62

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
174	Not having a meaningful life philosophy	0.43	0.75	0.47	0.68	-0.54	-0.05	0.44	0.72	1.64	2.21
175	Having trouble getting my priorities in order	0.79	0.94	0.91	0.94	-1.35	-0.13	0.84	0.94	0.84	-0.31
176	Having trouble functioning in a disorganized environment	0.76	0.84	0.76	0.85	0.09	0.01	0.77	0.85	0.81	-0.27
177	Being afraid of taking chances	0.59	0.76	0.85	0.87	-3.17**	-0.32	0.70	0.82	0.98	0.26
178	Whining or complaining too much	0.69	0.80	0.60	0.73	1.08	0.11	0.65	0.77	1.05	0.65
179	Finding most people uninteresting	0.50	0.74	0.70	0.82	-2.62**	-0.26	0.58	0.78	1.25	0.95
180	Having a dark sense of humor	0.38	0.65	0.74	0.83	-4.84**	-0.48	0.54	0.75	1.34	1.25
181	Talking too much	0.67	0.86	0.60	0.81	0.90	0.09	0.64	0.84	1.18	0.58
182	Not having a like-minded person to share interests with	0.48	0.73	0.73	0.89	-3.11**	-0.31	0.59	0.81	1.24	0.72
183	Feeling unrewarded by my achievements	0.60	0.73	0.78	0.88	-2.25*	-0.22	0.68	0.80	0.99	0.26
184	Lacking in emotional depth	0.33	0.64	0.54	0.79	-2.94**	-0.29	0.42	0.71	1.78	2.82
185	Needing to be right	0.78	0.84	0.77	0.89	0.15	0.02	0.78	0.86	0.92	0.09
186	Being overly critical of myself	1.12	0.98	1.05	0.96	0.73	0.07	1.09	0.97	0.53	-0.71
187	Being too picky or fussy	0.72	0.85	0.77	0.89	-0.61	-0.06	0.75	0.87	0.99	0.19
188	Having trouble getting along with others	0.30	0.59	0.38	0.68	-1.16	-0.12	0.33	0.63	2.10	4.59
189	Difficulty prioritizing things I need to do	0.84	0.92	0.92	0.92	-0.83	-0.08	0.88	0.92	0.76	-0.36
190	Pushing too hard to excel	0.62	0.79	0.63	0.79	-0.13	-0.01	0.63	0.79	1.12	0.64
191	Being overly modest about my positive characteristics	0.61	0.77	0.80	0.88	-2.23*	-0.22	0.69	0.82	0.95	0.01
192	Difficulty staying out of other people's business	0.32	0.58	0.53	0.70	-3.24**	-0.32	0.41	0.64	1.51	2.01
193	Difficulty taking the lead	0.56	0.81	0.71	0.82	-1.84	-0.18	0.62	0.82	1.17	0.61
194	Blaming others for problems	0.37	0.64	0.49	0.69	-1.87	-0.19	0.43	0.67	1.43	1.31
195	Living in a dream world	0.43	0.76	0.45	0.72	-0.32	-0.03	0.44	0.74	1.68	2.18
196	Being unrealistically or excessively optimistic	0.41	0.71	0.47	0.72	-0.73	-0.07	0.44	0.72	1.62	2.07
197	Reacting too quickly to things	0.61	0.75	0.68	0.83	-0.87	-0.09	0.64	0.79	1.12	0.70
198	Difficulty asking for support from others	1.00	0.97	1.06	0.97	-0.69	-0.07	1.02	0.97	0.57	-0.72
199	Pushing away others who get too close	0.76	0.90	0.61	0.87	1.63	0.16	0.70	0.89	1.14	0.41
200	Avoiding confrontation when problems arise	0.82	0.86	0.81	0.84	0.14	0.01	0.81	0.85	0.75	-0.28
201	Not pursuing what I want most in life	0.86	0.99	0.93	0.96	-0.70	-0.07	0.89	0.98	0.77	-0.55
202	Second guessing myself too much	1.25	0.97	1.15	0.95	0.96	0.10	1.21	0.96	0.41	-0.77
203	Feeling like the cause of problems	0.75	0.89	0.76	0.88	-0.06	-0.01	0.75	0.88	1.04	0.30

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
204	Being seen as fake or superficial	0.26	0.55	0.43	0.72	-2.75**	-0.27	0.34	0.64	1.92	3.15
205	Difficulty giving up unattainable goals	0.48	0.77	0.57	0.81	-1.16	-0.12	0.52	0.79	1.46	1.44
206	Overanalyzing everything	1.24	1.03	1.19	0.98	0.49	0.05	1.22	1.01	0.35	-0.97
207	Spending too much time and energy in sexual activity	0.20	0.52	0.39	0.68	-3.19**	-0.32	0.29	0.60	2.23	4.75
208	Getting easily overwhelmed	0.90	0.91	0.68	0.81	2.58*	0.26	0.81	0.88	0.76	-0.40
209	Feeling deserving of special treatment	0.30	0.58	0.38	0.61	-1.40	-0.14	0.33	0.60	1.81	3.10
210	Difficulty telling another person what I want	0.87	0.86	0.97	0.94	-1.06	-0.11	0.91	0.90	0.65	-0.47
211	Bossing around others too much	0.29	0.56	0.29	0.52	0.06	0.01	0.29	0.54	1.89	3.61
212	Having trouble keeping up with new technology	0.23	0.52	0.31	0.67	-1.43	-0.14	0.27	0.59	2.52	6.69
213	Getting into trouble with the law	0.06	0.28	0.19	0.46	-3.34**	-0.33	0.12	0.37	3.33	11.14
214	Being unable to say “no”	0.93	0.91	0.91	0.97	0.13	0.01	0.92	0.93	0.69	-0.49
215	Overinterpreting mild symptoms as signs of illness	0.39	0.69	0.44	0.81	-0.68	-0.07	0.41	0.74	1.87	2.91
216	Difficulty managing my time	1.03	0.95	1.07	0.95	-0.44	-0.04	1.05	0.95	0.54	-0.68
217	Being unwilling to compromise with others	0.36	0.62	0.49	0.66	-1.99*	-0.20	0.42	0.64	1.48	1.92
218	Trying to get away with things too often	0.53	0.79	0.65	0.79	-1.50	-0.15	0.59	0.79	1.29	1.07
219	Giving too much to others	0.79	0.87	0.69	0.81	1.20	0.12	0.75	0.85	0.88	-0.09
220	Avoiding people or social situations	0.55	0.81	0.66	0.87	-1.36	-0.14	0.60	0.83	1.32	0.98
221	Being insensitive to the thoughts, feelings, and needs of others	0.31	0.59	0.47	0.69	-2.51*	-0.25	0.38	0.64	1.76	2.89
222	Being giddy and overly excitable	0.50	0.72	0.40	0.67	1.32	0.13	0.46	0.70	1.56	2.15
223	Lacking respect for people's attitudes and opinions	0.44	0.68	0.47	0.68	-0.45	-0.04	0.45	0.68	1.53	2.11
224	Difficulty developing close and lasting relationships	0.57	0.87	0.64	0.88	-0.84	-0.08	0.60	0.87	1.28	0.60
225	Being uninterested in sex	0.13	0.48	0.21	0.53	-1.62	-0.16	0.17	0.50	3.45	12.64
226	Feeling that best efforts are never good enough	0.80	0.92	0.69	0.87	1.22	0.12	0.75	0.90	0.95	-0.10
227	Feeling dissatisfied with my appearance	1.05	1.01	0.67	0.84	4.07**	0.41	0.89	0.95	0.86	-0.23
228	Not enjoying the company of others	0.30	0.59	0.35	0.63	-0.83	-0.08	0.33	0.61	2.09	4.73
229	Getting easily frustrated	0.85	0.89	0.78	0.83	0.80	0.08	0.83	0.87	0.80	-0.16
230	Having trouble making even minor decisions	0.62	0.78	0.59	0.82	0.45	0.04	0.60	0.79	1.19	0.69
231	Spending too much time working	0.32	0.68	0.41	0.73	-1.23	-0.12	0.36	0.70	1.97	3.19
232	Blowing feelings out of proportion	0.55	0.79	0.51	0.72	0.47	0.05	0.54	0.76	1.41	1.49

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
233	Difficulty showing love and affection to others	0.60	0.81	0.67	0.86	-0.86	-0.09	0.63	0.83	1.27	0.93
234	Being unable to act naturally around others	0.40	0.69	0.42	0.62	-0.36	-0.04	0.41	0.66	1.67	2.66
235	Difficulty making or keeping friends	0.55	0.78	0.50	0.69	0.70	0.07	0.53	0.74	1.22	0.68
236	Having trouble breaking the same routine	0.56	0.74	0.74	0.81	-2.32*	-0.23	0.64	0.77	1.01	0.36
237	Feeling cheated, victimized, or abused by others	0.41	0.69	0.49	0.75	-1.11	-0.11	0.44	0.72	1.69	2.54
238	Being unable to work without clear rules and guidelines	0.65	0.77	0.69	0.81	-0.46	-0.05	0.67	0.79	0.94	0.09
239	Difficulty dealing with life transitions	0.63	0.76	0.59	0.73	0.57	0.06	0.62	0.75	1.04	0.54
240	Being easily affected by emotions	0.95	0.95	0.70	0.84	2.76**	0.27	0.84	0.91	0.78	-0.38
241	Not reaching my full potential	1.09	1.02	1.35	1.04	-2.45*	-0.24	1.21	1.04	0.32	-1.09
242	Starting arguments and conflicts with others	0.34	0.63	0.44	0.65	-1.54	-0.15	0.39	0.64	1.79	3.42
243	Acting childishly or immature	0.49	0.76	0.65	0.77	-2.05*	-0.20	0.56	0.77	1.27	0.97
244	Taking things too personally	0.89	0.92	0.78	0.85	1.23	0.12	0.84	0.89	0.80	-0.24
245	Acting superior or condescending toward others	0.34	0.63	0.51	0.64	-2.53*	-0.25	0.42	0.64	1.50	1.98
246	Lacking purpose or direction in life	0.68	0.88	0.90	1.00	-2.36*	-0.24	0.77	0.94	0.94	-0.25
247	Feeling misunderstood by others	0.75	0.84	0.82	0.83	-0.94	-0.09	0.78	0.83	0.79	-0.19
248	Difficulty expressing my feelings	0.84	0.92	0.84	0.97	0.06	0.01	0.84	0.94	0.80	-0.46
249	Not fitting in with other people	0.58	0.77	0.65	0.81	-0.96	-0.10	0.61	0.79	1.26	1.11
250	Acting too competitively	0.54	0.78	0.72	0.89	-2.21*	-0.22	0.62	0.83	1.19	0.54
251	Forgiving people too easily	0.75	0.87	0.70	0.84	0.60	0.06	0.73	0.85	0.98	0.16
252	Having trouble staying focused	1.07	0.94	1.06	1.03	0.17	0.02	1.07	0.98	0.52	-0.78
253	Distancing myself when relationships are strained	0.75	0.84	0.71	0.90	0.51	0.05	0.74	0.86	0.94	0.01
254	Letting others make decisions too often	0.75	0.89	0.69	0.80	0.72	0.07	0.73	0.85	0.94	0.04
255	Feeling distressed by sexual habits or desires	0.15	0.48	0.24	0.57	-1.78	-0.18	0.19	0.52	3.28	11.74
256	Getting too closely involved with relatives	0.16	0.48	0.18	0.42	-0.40	-0.04	0.17	0.45	3.03	10.48
257	Difficulty hiding my feelings	0.47	0.74	0.38	0.65	1.33	0.13	0.44	0.70	1.55	1.76
258	Having mood swings	0.79	0.85	0.51	0.73	3.52**	0.35	0.67	0.81	1.07	0.52
259	Having trouble being practical	0.43	0.69	0.47	0.69	-0.57	-0.06	0.44	0.69	1.52	1.83
260	Underestimating my abilities and skills	0.84	0.86	0.80	0.89	0.50	0.05	0.83	0.87	0.82	-0.12
261	Acting in ways that I later regret	0.75	0.87	0.82	0.84	-0.74	-0.07	0.78	0.86	0.93	0.16
262	Using drugs or alcohol too much	0.19	0.53	0.37	0.67	-3.09**	-0.31	0.26	0.60	2.47	5.93

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
263	Having trouble asserting myself	0.56	0.78	0.73	0.79	-2.16*	-0.22	0.64	0.79	1.00	0.20
264	Getting easily hurt by criticism	0.90	0.89	0.77	0.85	1.46	0.15	0.85	0.88	0.74	-0.33
265	Difficulty taking care of health problems	0.52	0.82	0.74	0.93	-2.51*	-0.25	0.62	0.87	1.32	0.86
266	Cheating or stealing from others	0.07	0.31	0.27	0.62	-4.27**	-0.43	0.16	0.48	3.44	12.82
267	Having chronic pain, headaches, or stomach discomfort	0.69	0.96	0.49	0.84	2.21*	0.22	0.60	0.92	1.39	0.82
268	Feeling disappointed about lack of accomplishments	0.97	0.95	0.98	0.96	-0.12	-0.01	0.97	0.95	0.58	-0.73
269	Disliking most people	0.41	0.70	0.48	0.71	-0.98	-0.10	0.44	0.71	1.65	2.45
270	Reacting too slowly to things	0.42	0.70	0.49	0.72	-1.01	-0.10	0.45	0.71	1.61	2.29
271	Feeling guilty about past mistakes	0.87	0.89	0.90	0.93	-0.35	-0.03	0.88	0.91	0.75	-0.32
272	Acting selfishly with others	0.35	0.64	0.40	0.60	-0.80	-0.08	0.38	0.62	1.61	2.22
273	Being overly direct about my beliefs, attitudes, or opinions	0.35	0.60	0.49	0.67	-2.15*	-0.21	0.41	0.63	1.44	1.67
274	Feeling tense or anxious	0.73	0.86	0.72	0.83	0.13	0.01	0.73	0.85	0.95	0.07
275	Comparing myself to others too much	1.12	0.96	1.05	1.01	0.77	0.08	1.09	0.98	0.45	-0.87
276	Being insensitive to social rules and customs	0.24	0.47	0.48	0.69	-4.10**	-0.41	0.34	0.59	1.65	2.37
277	Not supporting others enough	0.34	0.66	0.48	0.68	-1.99*	-0.20	0.40	0.67	1.69	2.56
278	Not having a belief system to guide my life	0.41	0.71	0.49	0.76	-1.10	-0.11	0.45	0.73	1.55	1.65
279	Having trouble getting started on things	0.87	0.92	0.98	0.90	-1.17	-0.12	0.92	0.91	0.63	-0.59
280	Overreacting to losses, setbacks, or failures	0.78	0.89	0.74	0.90	0.42	0.04	0.76	0.89	0.90	-0.20
281	Being overly protective of loved ones	0.91	0.93	0.80	0.89	1.14	0.11	0.86	0.92	0.74	-0.46
282	Having trouble accepting things I don't agree with	0.70	0.81	0.78	0.79	-0.95	-0.09	0.74	0.80	0.71	-0.50
283	Doing things that can harm my body (e.g., cutting, burning, hitting, scratching)	0.36	0.65	0.52	0.69	-2.40*	-0.24	0.44	0.68	1.45	1.41
284	Arguing with people too much	0.38	0.67	0.48	0.73	-1.34	-0.13	0.43	0.70	1.59	1.88
285	Feeling shy or embarrassed about sex	0.21	0.55	0.36	0.65	-2.57*	-0.26	0.28	0.60	2.30	5.07
286	Not having any long-term plans	0.48	0.79	0.81	0.94	-3.85**	-0.38	0.62	0.87	1.19	0.35
287	Telling personal things to other people too often	0.50	0.73	0.54	0.72	-0.49	-0.05	0.52	0.73	1.43	1.88
288	Feeling touchy or irritable	0.53	0.75	0.59	0.79	-0.79	-0.08	0.56	0.77	1.26	0.94
289	Feeling stuck or stifled by society's rules and expectations	0.63	0.82	0.69	0.85	-0.65	-0.06	0.66	0.83	1.11	0.46
290	Being afraid of trying new things	0.56	0.73	0.66	0.82	-1.36	-0.14	0.60	0.77	1.17	0.83
291	Acting defensively when criticized or challenged	0.59	0.76	0.71	0.79	-1.49	-0.15	0.65	0.77	1.06	0.59

Appendix

*Descriptive Statistics of Personality Problems in a College Student Sample – Overall and Separated by Gender (Continued)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Women<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Men<sup>b</sup></i>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Overall<sup>c</sup></i>			
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>
292	Being troubled by the sexual attitudes and behaviors of others	0.31	0.64	0.35	0.58	-0.59	-0.06	0.33	0.62	2.02	4.05
293	Difficulty adjusting to change	0.67	0.82	0.66	0.77	0.04	0.00	0.67	0.80	0.96	0.13
294	Having trouble understanding facial expressions and gestures of others	0.31	0.61	0.39	0.62	-1.33	-0.13	0.35	0.62	1.90	3.70
295	Difficulty accepting love and affection from others	0.53	0.80	0.56	0.79	-0.28	-0.03	0.54	0.79	1.36	1.06
296	Having trouble being self-sufficient	0.46	0.72	0.51	0.76	-0.66	-0.07	0.48	0.73	1.52	1.75
297	Losing or having things stolen	0.45	0.78	0.46	0.72	-0.16	-0.02	0.45	0.75	1.67	2.14
298	Doing things over and over again	0.56	0.79	0.69	0.78	-1.64	-0.16	0.62	0.78	1.09	0.45
299	Spending too much time on hobbies	0.47	0.74	0.72	0.81	-3.19**	-0.32	0.58	0.78	1.24	0.87
300	Dominating or intimidating others	0.29	0.57	0.27	0.55	0.39	0.04	0.28	0.56	2.05	3.97
301	Procrastinating too much	1.54	1.06	1.62	1.08	-0.71	-0.07	1.58	1.07	-0.08	-1.23
302	Being unable to fully connect with others	0.70	0.85	0.70	0.83	-0.07	-0.01	0.70	0.84	0.98	0.13
303	Having trouble finding a job	0.62	0.90	0.81	1.00	-1.97*	-0.20	0.70	0.95	1.17	0.25
304	Thinking poorly of myself	0.91	0.99	0.90	0.94	0.17	0.02	0.91	0.97	0.73	-0.56
305	Difficulty resisting temptations	0.75	0.88	0.89	0.88	-1.61	-0.16	0.81	0.88	0.85	-0.13
306	Difficulty understanding things	0.54	0.73	0.57	0.71	-0.43	-0.04	0.56	0.72	1.21	1.17
307	Feeling that things are outside my control	0.76	0.88	0.76	0.80	0.02	0.00	0.76	0.84	0.87	-0.04
308	Making others close to me miserable	0.22	0.58	0.31	0.59	-1.56	-0.16	0.25	0.58	2.62	7.22
309	Getting easily distracted	1.09	0.94	1.21	1.02	-1.27	-0.13	1.14	0.97	0.40	-0.87
310	Feeling indifferent about loved ones	0.31	0.64	0.41	0.63	-1.54	-0.15	0.35	0.64	2.06	4.53

*Note.* Ratings made on a 0 to 3 scale. \*\* $p < .01$ . \* $p < .05$ ; two-tailed. <sup>a</sup> $N = 232$ , <sup>b</sup> $N = 176$ , <sup>c</sup> $N = 409$ .