

## National differences in personality; Brazil and England

NICHOLAS TARRIER

*Universidade Federal da Paraíba*

and

SYBIL B. G. EYSENCK and HANS J. EYSENCK

*Institute of Psychiatry, University of London*

(Received 10 June 1979)

**Summary**—The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (E.P.Q.) was used to compare the structure of personality in Brazilian and English men and women, and to compare the mean scores of these population on the test. Six hundred and thirty six male and 760 female Brazilian adults were compared with 500 English males and 500 English females. It was found that identical factors appeared in the Brazilian as had been discovered in the English populations, and that intercorrelations of scales, reliabilities, etc. were similar for the two populations. Some items from the original study were found inapplicable in Brazil, and new items were substituted. A comparison of the mean scores of the two populations on a reduced scale, embodying only those items which were valid for both populations, showed that there were very few differences between the populations.

### INTRODUCTION

There exists quite a large literature on the subject of national differences in personality. Most of the studies in this area have used standard questionnaires of personality, administered to residents of these various countries, and compared their scores with those given by the original standardization groups (e.g. Honess and Kline, 1974; Hosseini *et al.*, 1973; Kline, 1967; Mehryar *et al.*, 1975; Orpen, 1972). There are obvious criticisms of such simplistic methods, the major criticism being that the meaning of certain actions or attitudes canvassed in personality questionnaires may change completely as we pass from one country, and one culture, to another (Butcher and Pancheri, 1976). Thus, while psychometric scores can be obtained readily enough, the meaning of these scores is not always apparent, and any straightforward interpretation of results is of doubtful psychological value (Eysenck *et al.*, 1977; Iwawaki *et al.*, 1977). We have experimented over the past few years with a method that seems capable of overcoming this difficulty, and after discussing it briefly will offer some empirical data to illustrate its working (Lojk *et al.* in press).

Our approach is based on an extension of the psychometric method used to provide internal validation for trait or type questionnaires within a given culture. Consider the methodology used for the construction of measures of extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1969, 1975). Given the hypothesis that a given trait or type concept may with advantage be postulated, items are written which express the putative nature of the trait/type as expressed in a variety of situations. Questionnaires containing numbers of such items are then administered to suitable populations, the item answers are correlated, and a factor analysis is carried out. Depending on the results of such an analysis, the postulated factor may be rejected as non-existent (or at least as impossible to measure and determine by means of the chosen items), or it may be concluded that something similar to the postulated factor emerges from the data, but not as clearly defined as one might wish. Psychometrically 'bad' items are then excluded, new ones written, and the whole process is repeated as many times as is necessary to achieve a satisfactory scale (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1976).

This method may with advantage be used in trying to ascertain whether certain personality factors can be measured meaningfully in a different country/culture. What is required is the application of the scale in question to residents in the country of origin (in our case England), and in the country to be compared. Provided suitable populations have been chosen for testing (selected for age, sex, social status, education, etc.), we can now lay down the rule that the scores on the tests are comparable *if, and only if, the correlation matrices between items are identical (or closely similar) between the two countries*. A related test would be the factor loadings of the items, using perhaps factor comparison techniques such as those discussed in Eysenck and Eysenck (1969). Coefficients of factor comparisons of above 0.95 might be required in order to accept the test results as properly comparable.

Three possible outcomes of such a study might be expected. There might be well-nigh perfect comparability; there might be complete lack of comparability; and there might be a fair degree of comparability, but with distinct exceptions. The first of these (almost perfect comparability) has been found by us in several studies comparing English and foreign groups where the foreign groups were culturally close to the English, e.g. New Zealand, or even not so close, as in Yugoslavia. Complete lack of comparability has never been found by us; identical factors, clearly recognizable and with high factor comparison indices, have never failed to appear, even in unlikely samples (e.g. Nigeria, Japan). Most frequent were results showing good agreement, but with definite exceptions, i.e. with some items which failed to show even reasonably similar factor loadings on what were clearly identical factors.

The existence of such items, provided they were capable of some rational explanation, might advance our understanding of national differences and similarities in personality, and a special effort was made to discover such explanations.

## EXPERIMENT AND ANALYSIS

The experiment to be reported consists essentially of a detailed comparison of factor loadings between the English Standardization of the E.P.Q. (Eysenck Personality Questionnaire—Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) and a group of Brazilian men and women. The Brazilian sample was obtained from the North Eastern state of Paraíba, principally the state capital, João Pessoa. The region is underdeveloped, mainly rural and socially traditional. Social class is generally polarised although in the capital city there is an emergent professional and middle class.

The English version of the E.P.Q. was translated into Portuguese using the back translation method. The final version was compiled after further consultation with special attention to Brazilian idioms. Twelve new items were written, in order to have some alternatives available in case some of the original items were found not to be applicable in Brazil; these new items are numbered 101 to 112 (copies of the Portuguese version of the E.P.Q. can be obtained from S. B. G. Eysenck).

The Brazilian sample was obtained with the help of twenty-six student assistants who distributed the questionnaire. Each assistant attempted to obtain a distribution of age representative of the population by recruiting equal numbers in the age groups: 16–19; 20–24; 25–34; 35–44; 45–75 years. Within each age group approximately equal numbers of male and female, and upper and lower class subjects were recruited. The obtained sample consisted of 636 men and 760 women with an average age of approximately thirty years (Men: 30.36, S.D. 12.68; Women 28.94, S.D. 12.24). The English sample used for the factor analysis consisted of 500 men and 500 women, taken from samples five to seven times larger, and used to establish means and standard deviations for the scores of the different scales which go to make up the E.P.Q. [The English sample, while not random, gives results very similar to those obtained with a quota sample (Eysenck, 1979)].

These scales are: P (Psychoticism), E (Extraversion), N (Neuroticism) and L (a Lie or dissimulation scale). Fortunately social class has not been found related to personality in any systematic fashion in the English sample (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1976), so that any difference in this respect between the samples would not be likely to affect the results. The Brazilian data were analysed in exactly the same manner as the English data had been analysed, i.e. product-moment correlations between items were factor analysed by principal component methods, rotated by Varimax and then obliquely by Promax, taking the first four factors extracted only for rotational purposes. The actual items used are given in the Appendix; in the Tables they will be referred to by their numbers only.

## RESULTS

Tables 1–4 show the factor loadings of the Brazilian men and women on the items which in the English analysis loaded most highly on the P, E, N and L factors; the English loadings are given in Eysenck and Eysenck (1976). Table 1 refers to the P factor. Six items, given at the bottom of the Table, show poor loadings for the male, female or both samples. Another six items, most of them from among the newly written ones, give acceptable loadings; these items are given in the middle set of items in the Table. The factor can be identified without doubt as one of psychoticism.

Table 2 sets out in a similar manner the loadings for extraversion. Here only four items are unsatisfactory, and one new item is added. Again, the factor is unmistakably identical with the one originally identified in England.

Table 1.

	Males (N = 636)				Females (N = 760)			
	P	E	N	L	P	E	N	L
-2	-0.19	0.01	-0.01	0.20	-0.27	-0.02	-0.01	0.19
-6	-0.36	-0.09	0.15	-0.05	-0.35	-0.09	0.23	0.09
-9	-0.26	0.07	0.16	0.14	-0.25	0.06	0.05	0.24
-11	-0.40	0.01	0.02	-0.15	-0.29	-0.03	-0.02	-0.24
23	0.41	0.00	0.08	-0.13	0.39	0.06	0.11	-0.02
27	0.27	0.21	0.17	-0.15	0.41	0.09	0.14	0.00
35	0.26	0.25	0.09	-0.23	0.29	0.10	0.02	-0.05
47	0.27	0.14	0.13	-0.00	0.29	0.20	0.06	-0.02
51	0.28	-0.00	0.03	-0.20	0.36	0.03	0.04	-0.12
55	0.27	0.07	0.19	0.18	0.21	0.12	0.13	0.14
-59	-0.47	-0.05	0.14	-0.14	-0.33	-0.00	0.09	-0.03
-63	-0.39	0.00	0.13	0.16	-0.10	0.11	0.07	0.31
-67	-0.53	0.04	0.00	-0.06	-0.12	0.08	0.04	0.01
71	0.34	0.14	0.32	0.12	0.33	0.01	0.31	0.06
-78	-0.30	-0.08	0.01	-0.21	-0.34	-0.00	-0.12	0.25
81	0.33	0.08	0.13	-0.04	0.08	0.09	0.10	-0.21
88	0.33	0.04	0.08	-0.14	0.20	0.14	0.15	-0.07
93	0.52	0.03	0.20	0.03	0.29	0.04	0.20	-0.06
-100	-0.38	0.07	0.09	0.09	-0.41	0.06	0.12	-0.06
-43	-0.38	0.11	-0.06	-0.15	-0.32	0.12	0.02	-0.10
-99	-0.35	-0.01	0.02	0.03	-0.25	0.07	-0.05	0.13
-102	-0.33	0.20	0.08	0.17	-0.30	0.08	0.01	0.12
-103	-0.42	0.05	0.07	0.15	-0.32	0.06	-0.02	0.01
-106	-0.25	0.07	0.12	0.12	-0.25	-0.01	0.09	0.08
-109	-0.41	0.04	-0.07	0.10	-0.27	0.07	0.01	0.13
-19	-0.11	0.16	0.06	0.17	-0.18	0.17	0.15	0.22
31	0.14	0.11	0.33	-0.05	0.18	0.18	0.32	-0.10
-39	-0.20	0.10	0.14	0.26	-0.27	0.13	0.16	0.27
74	0.15	0.05	0.02	-0.05	0.07	0.11	-0.00	-0.05
85	0.32	-0.07	0.32	0.09	0.24	0.07	0.37	0.11
97	0.10	0.14	0.34	0.09	0.30	0.02	0.35	0.15

## NOTES AND SHORTER COMMUNICATIONS

Table 2.

	Males (N = 636)				Females (N = 760)			
	P	E	N	L	P	E	N	L
1	0.10	0.32	-0.12	-0.09	0.02	0.30	-0.08	-0.09
5	0.11	0.49	0.02	-0.06	0.03	0.49	0.01	-0.12
10	0.01	0.63	-0.13	0.04	0.09	0.70	-0.12	0.10
15	-0.08	0.50	-0.13	-0.05	-0.00	0.54	-0.18	-0.06
18	-0.35	0.32	-0.01	-0.01	-0.30	0.33	-0.03	0.03
-22	0.01	-0.29	0.21	-0.07	0.01	-0.26	0.20	-0.05
-26	-0.11	0.45	-0.07	-0.16	-0.06	0.45	-0.07	-0.20
34	-0.16	0.50	-0.03	-0.04	-0.17	0.47	-0.10	0.14
42	-0.03	0.50	0.09	0.19	0.05	0.43	0.08	0.14
-46	0.14	-0.33	0.25	0.15	0.14	-0.31	0.27	0.20
50	0.11	0.63	0.03	0.13	0.10	0.66	0.01	0.11
54	-0.07	0.49	-0.01	-0.16	-0.05	0.46	-0.02	-0.21
62	0.02	0.33	-0.01	0.29	-0.03	0.41	0.04	0.17
66	0.02	0.34	0.07	-0.02	-0.06	0.29	0.05	0.05
77	0.16	0.67	-0.04	0.11	0.12	0.71	-0.04	0.04
92	0.01	0.45	-0.12	-0.27	-0.07	0.45	-0.05	-0.25
96	-0.06	0.49	0.09	-0.05	0.02	0.53	0.02	0.02
72	-0.02	0.20	0.06	-0.01	-0.21	0.27	0.09	-0.05
-30	0.15	-0.09	0.17	0.29	0.16	-0.04	0.15	0.27
38	0.26	0.16	-0.38	0.02	0.25	0.15	-0.42	-0.05
58	-0.08	0.23	-0.06	-0.33	-0.18	0.20	-0.14	-0.39
70	0.06	0.21	0.29	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.14	0.18

Table 3.

	Males (N = 636)				Females (N = 760)			
	P	E	N	L	P	E	N	L
3	-0.01	-0.10	0.32	-0.12	0.02	-0.06	0.53	-0.08
7	0.07	-0.02	0.32	-0.29	0.04	0.03	0.34	-0.29
12	-0.27	0.04	0.40	-0.03	-0.12	-0.00	0.39	-0.07
16	-0.00	-0.13	0.25	-0.24	0.01	-0.07	0.39	-0.12
20	-0.15	-0.10	0.34	-0.19	-0.15	-0.03	0.46	-0.15
24	0.23	-0.13	0.41	0.03	0.13	-0.07	0.50	-0.07
28	-0.03	0.11	0.50	0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.41	-0.07
32	-0.04	-0.05	0.45	-0.07	-0.04	-0.04	0.54	-0.02
36	-0.24	-0.13	0.51	-0.01	-0.16	-0.07	0.60	0.04
40	-0.25	0.08	0.39	0.10	-0.21	0.09	0.44	0.22
44	0.02	-0.02	0.46	-0.10	0.01	0.01	0.47	-0.11
60	0.22	-0.11	0.28	0.15	0.16	-0.04	0.31	0.14
64	0.06	-0.11	0.48	0.05	0.05	-0.17	0.53	0.06
75	0.11	-0.05	0.34	-0.23	0.06	-0.01	0.28	-0.21
79	-0.26	-0.13	0.38	-0.10	-0.22	-0.02	0.45	-0.06
82	0.03	-0.06	0.45	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.51	0.10
86	0.16	-0.17	0.36	-0.08	0.07	-0.15	0.47	-0.08
89	-0.03	0.00	0.31	-0.03	0.01	-0.08	0.41	0.03
98	-0.21	0.05	0.31	-0.25	-0.21	0.01	0.30	-0.31
31	0.14	0.11	0.33	-0.05	0.18	0.18	0.32	-0.10
48	0.03	0.10	0.49	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.48	-0.07
97	0.10	0.14	0.34	0.09	0.30	0.02	0.35	0.15
110	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.17	-0.19	0.01	0.36	0.17
52	-0.18	0.16	0.14	0.15	-0.20	0.13	0.14	0.31
68	0.31	-0.05	0.39	0.05	0.35	0.00	0.35	0.06
72	-0.02	0.20	0.06	-0.01	-0.21	0.27	0.09	-0.05
94	-0.14	-0.00	0.18	-0.37	-0.30	0.09	0.21	-0.41

Table 4.

	Males (N = 636)				Females (N = 760)			
	P	E	N	L	P	E	N	L
13	-0.14	0.15	0.14	0.31	-0.06	0.21	0.07	0.34
-17	0.32	0.06	0.16	-0.28	0.19	0.05	0.27	-0.35
21	-0.07	0.17	0.01	0.39	0.04	0.17	0.01	0.38
-25	0.05	0.06	0.04	-0.52	0.05	-0.00	-0.02	-0.49
-29	0.23	0.15	0.16	-0.27	0.12	0.12	0.07	-0.32
37	0.06	-0.05	0.19	0.38	0.05	0.01	0.12	0.44
-41	-0.02	0.09	0.03	-0.49	-0.03	0.04	0.00	-0.39
-49	0.03	0.22	0.06	-0.35	0.02	0.18	0.16	-0.30
-53	-0.14	0.04	0.15	-0.55	-0.05	0.04	0.14	-0.50
-57	0.11	0.05	0.06	-0.36	0.02	0.09	0.13	-0.36
-65	0.13	0.11	-0.05	-0.49	0.11	0.11	0.00	-0.41
-69	0.13	0.11	0.01	-0.47	0.17	0.16	0.09	-0.37
-76	0.11	-0.01	-0.01	-0.43	0.08	-0.00	0.05	-0.35
-80	0.06	0.05	0.05	-0.45	-0.04	0.04	0.14	-0.41
87	-0.07	0.11	0.07	0.38	-0.09	0.26	-0.02	0.33
-91	-0.19	0.01	0.03	-0.46	-0.12	-0.06	-0.04	-0.43
-95	-0.02	-0.08	0.03	-0.51	-0.08	-0.13	0.05	-0.50
-45	-0.07	-0.01	0.01	-0.45	0.07	0.08	-0.03	-0.35
-83	-0.03	0.05	0.14	-0.50	0.09	0.06	0.23	-0.37
-90	-0.03	0.11	-0.10	-0.37	-0.00	0.12	-0.09	-0.40
-104	0.04	0.07	0.04	-0.38	0.08	0.09	0.06	-0.29
-105	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	-0.46	0.00	-0.02	0.04	-0.35
-4	0.31	0.13	0.15	-0.07	0.16	0.07	0.22	-0.02
-8	0.08	0.17	0.23	-0.28	0.19	0.18	0.15	-0.18
61	-0.33	0.08	0.09	0.21	-0.28	0.10	0.08	0.29
99	-0.35	-0.01	0.02	0.03	-0.25	0.07	-0.05	0.13

Table 3 deals with neuroticism. Four items are relatively unsatisfactory, and four new items can be used to replace these. The factor is without question identical with the original one in the English standardization.

Table 4 deals with the lie scale. Four items are unsatisfactory, and five new items are available to replace them. The scale is for all practical purposes identical with the original one.

Table 5. Reliabilities

	P	E	N	L
Male ( <i>N</i> = 636)	0.69	0.77	0.74	0.80
Female ( <i>N</i> = 760)	0.62	0.78	0.79	0.76

We must now turn to the reliabilities (alpha coefficients) of the scales; these are given in Table 5. It will be seen that with the exception of the P scale these reliabilities are satisfactory, and for P they fall just below the level of 0.70. This suggests that the scales measure something very similar to the factors measured in the English population, and this is borne out by the indices of factor comparison, which are given in Table 6; all are above 0.98, thus indicating virtual identity of factor between the two nations under comparison.

Table 6. Factor comparisons

	P	E	N	L
Brazilian M vs English M	0.998	0.992	0.997	0.999
Brazilian F vs English F	0.992	0.981	0.996	0.990
Brazilian M vs Brazilian F	0.990	0.999	0.995	0.991

Table 7 sets out the intercorrelations between factors (a) and between scales (b). These are similar to those found in England, with the PL (negative) correlation the highest. The NL correlation is small, indicating that little dissimulation has taken place (Michaelis and Eysenck, 1971).

Table 7. Intercorrelations

	(a) Factors		(b) Scales		
	M	F	M	F	
PE	-0.02	0.02	PE	0.05	0.06
PN	0.16	0.10	PN	0.26	0.23
PL	-0.24	-0.18	PL	-0.45	-0.37
EN	-0.07	-0.10	EN	-0.18	-0.22
EL	-0.02	-0.09	EL	-0.08	-0.06
NL	-0.11	-0.07	NL	-0.24	-0.21

New scales can be written for use in Brazil, omitting those items which have poor loadings, and adding new items with good loadings, as indicated in Tables 1 to 4. When these new scales are analysed, we obtain somewhat better reliabilities, as is shown in Table 8. It is suggested that for future use in Brazil, or other Portuguese speaking countries, these new scales be adopted. We have added the letters P, E, N and L to the items in the appendix to indicate the new scales, and we have added a + or a - sign to each letter to indicate in which direction the 'Yes' answer to that item should be scored.

Table 8. Reliabilities

	P	E	N	L
Male	0.74	0.78	0.77	0.82
Female	0.63	0.79	0.82	0.78

Table 9 gives the means and S.D.s on the four new scales for the men and women separately; these values may be used as standardization data until better data are available. They cannot of course be compared with the original English standardization data because the scales are not using the same items throughout.

Intercorrelations between the new factors and scales were calculated, but are sufficiently similar to the old factors and scales not to require printing here. We believe that the new scales measure essentially the same factors, P, E, N and L which were measured by the original scales in England, and that the slight changes which have been made in the composition of the scales serve the purpose of making them more reliable and useful.

Table 9. Means and S.D.

	P		E		N		L	
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.
Male	3.74	3.25	10.89	3.88	10.17	4.36	12.78	4.81
Female	2.90	2.49	10.26	4.02	11.60	4.85	13.51	4.29

#### NATIONAL COMPARISONS

It is impossible to compare Brazilian and English subjects directly through their scores on either the original or the new set of scales, as some items in each set of scales do not apply very well to the other population. The only way of achieving such a comparison is by reducing both sets of items in such a way that only items

Table 10

	P		E		N		L	
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.
Brazilian Males	2.85	2.57	10.37	3.78	8.59	3.77	10.03	3.79
Brazilian Females	2.23	2.06	9.67	3.90	9.80	4.20	10.54	3.43
English Males	2.74	2.38	10.51	4.24	8.01	4.45	4.92	3.31
English Females	2.05	1.93	10.31	4.16	10.60	4.36	5.29	3.29

loading equally well for both groups are retained; that means in effect retaining those items in Tables 1–4 which are printed in the first group of figures. Results of such a comparison are given above in Table 10 which prints the means and S.D.s for the two populations, and for men and women separately.

The results of this comparison show that differences between the countries are nonexistent for P and E, that Brazilian men are higher on neuroticism than English men, but Brazilian women are lower on neuroticism than English women; and that for the L scale the Brazilians have very much higher scores than do the English (at the  $p < 0.001$  level). As in England, Brazilian males have higher P scores than females, Brazilian males higher E scores than females, Brazilian females higher N scores than Brazilian males, and Brazilian females higher L scores than Brazilian males. In all these respects, therefore, these data show considerable similarities; with the exception of the L scale there are few differences in means between Brazilian and English. A possible explanation of the high L scores in the Brazilian sample could lie in the conforming nature of this type of traditional society. Rigid value systems and inflexibility of accepted behaviour could result in the internalizing of stereotypes or idealised self concepts. Hence Brazilian subjects answer some items in terms of this conforming model of expected behaviour. English subjects having a less traditional and more flexible value and behaviour system answer in a more 'honest' and less stereotyped manner.

We may conclude, that because of the similarity between these data that the new scales permit reasonable comparisons to be made between the two populations.

*Acknowledgements*—The research was supported in Brazil by a grant from the Pro-Reitoria de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa, Universidade Federal da Paraíba.

The authors would like to thank the student assistants for distributing the E.P.Q. in Paraíba and to Maria-Lucia Nunnes, Bartholomeu Trocolli and Ravi Sarthy for their help with the translation of the E.P.Q.

## REFERENCES

- BUTCHER J. N. and PANCHERI P. (1976) *A Handbook of Cross-Cultural MMPI Research*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- EYSENCK H. J. (1979) Personality factors in a random sample of the population. *Psychol. Rep.* **44**, 1023–1027.
- EYSENCK H. J. and EYSENCK S. B. G. (1969) *Personality Structure and Measurement*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- EYSENCK H. J. and EYSENCK S. B. G. (1975) *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- EYSENCK H. J. and EYSENCK S. B. G. (1976) *Psychoticism as a Dimension of Personality*. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- EYSENCK S. B. G., ADELAJA O. and EYSENCK H. J. (1977) A comparative study of personality in Nigerian and English subjects. *J. soc. Psychol.* **102**, 171–178.
- HONESS T. and KLINE P. (1974) The use of EPI and J.EPI with a student population in Uganda. *Br. J. soc. clin. Psychol.* **13**, 96–98.
- HOSSEINI A. A., MEHRYAR A. H. and RAZAVIEK A. A. (1973) Extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism as measured by Eysenck's inventory in Iran. *J. gen. Psychol.* **122**, 197–205.
- IWAWAKI S., EYSENCK S. B. G. and EYSENCK H. J. (1977) Differences in personality between Japanese and English. *J. Soc. Psychol.* **102**, 27–33.
- KLINE P. (1967). Extraversion, neuroticism and academic performance among Ghanaian university students. *Br. J. educ. Psychol.* **36**, 93–94.
- LOJK L., EYSENCK S. B. G. and EYSENCK H. J. (1979) National differences in personality in Yugoslavia and England. *Br. J. Psychol.*, **70**, 381–387.
- MEHRYAR A. H., HEKMAT H. and KHAJARI F. (1975) Comparison of Eysenck's PEN and Lanyon's Psychological Screening Inventory in a Group of American Students. *J. consult. clin. Psychol.* **43**, 9–12.
- MICHAELIS W. and EYSENCK H. J. (1971) The determination of personality inventory factor patterns and intercorrelations by changes in real-life motivation. *J. gen. Psychol.* **118**, 223–234.
- ORPEN L. (1972) The cross-cultural validity of Eysenck's personality inventory: a test in Afrikaans speaking South Africa. *Br. J. soc. clin. Psychol.* **11**, 244–248.

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

OCCUPATION \_\_\_\_\_ AGE \_\_\_\_\_ SEX \_\_\_\_\_

## INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer each question by putting a circle around the "YES" or the "NO" following the question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the question.

PLEASE REMEMBER TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION

1. Do you have many different hobbies? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
2. Do you stop to think things over before doing anything? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
3. Does your mood often go up and down? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
4. Have you ever taken the praise for something you knew someone else had really done? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
5. Are you a talkative person? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
6. Would being in debt worry you? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
7. Do you ever feel "just miserable" for no reason? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
8. Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
9. Do you lock up your house carefully at night? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
10. Are you rather lively? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
11. Would it upset you a lot to see a child or an animal suffer? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
12. Do you often worry about things you should not have done or said? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
13. If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
14. Would you enjoy parachute jumping? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
15. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
16. Are you an irritable person? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
17. Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
18. Do you enjoy meeting new people? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
19. Do you believe insurance schemes are a good idea? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
20. Are your feelings easily hurt? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
21. Are all your habits good and desirable ones? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
22. Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
23. Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
24. Do you often feel "fed-up"? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
25. Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
26. Do you like going out a lot? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
27. Do you enjoy hurting people you love? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
28. Are you often troubled about feelings of guilt? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
29. Do you sometimes talk about things you know nothing about? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
30. Do you prefer reading to meeting people? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
31. Do you have enemies who want to harm you? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
32. Would you call yourself a nervous person? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
33. Do you always say you are sorry when you have been rude? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
34. Do you have many friends? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
35. Do you enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
36. Are you a worrier? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO
37. As a child did you do as you were told immediately and without grumbling? \_\_\_\_\_ YES NO

38. Would you call yourself happy-go-lucky?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
39. Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
40. Do you worry about awful things that might happen?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
41. Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
42. Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
43. Can you easily understand the way people feel when they tell you their troubles?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
44. Would you call yourself tense or "highly-strung"?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
45. Do you throw waste paper on the floor when there is no waste paper basket handy?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
46. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
47. Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
48. Do you feel self pity now and again?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
49. Do you sometimes boast a little?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
50. Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
51. Do people who drive carefully annoy you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
52. Do you worry about your health?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
53. Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
54. Do you like telling jokes and funny stories to your friends?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
55. Do most things taste the same to you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
56. Do you sometimes sulk?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
57. As a child were you ever cheeky to your parents?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
58. Do you like mixing with people?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
59. Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
60. Do you suffer from sleeplessness?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
61. Do you always wash before a meal?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
62. Do you nearly always have a "ready answer" when people talk to you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
63. Do you like to arrive at appointments in plenty of time?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
64. Have you often felt listless and tired for no reason?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
65. Have you ever cheated at a game?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
66. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
67. Is (or was) your mother a good woman?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
68. Do you often feel life is very dull?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
69. Have you ever taken advantage of someone?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
70. Do you often take on more activities than you have time for?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
71. Are there several people who keep trying to avoid you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
72. Do you worry a lot about your looks?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
73. Are you always polite even to unpleasant people?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
74. Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurances?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
75. Have you ever wished that you were dead?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
76. Would you dodge paying taxes if you were sure you could never be found out?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
77. Can you get a party going?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
78. Do you try not to be rude to people?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
79. Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
80. Have you ever insisted on having your own way?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
81. When you catch a train do you often arrive at the last minute?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
82. Do you suffer from "nerves"?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
83. Have you ever deliberately said something to hurt someone's feelings?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
84. Do you hate being with a crowd who play harmless jokes on one another?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
85. Do your friendships break up easily without it being your fault?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO

86. Do you often feel lonely?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
87. Do you always practice what you preach?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
88. Do you sometimes like teasing animals?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
89. Are you easily hurt when people find fault with you or the work you do?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
90. Would life with no danger in it be too dull for you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
91. Have you ever been late for an appointment or work?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
92. Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
93. Would you like other people to be afraid of you?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
94. Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
95. Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
96. Do other people think of you as being very lively?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
97. Do people tell you a lot of lies?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
98. Are you touchy about some things?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
99. Are you always willing to admit it when you have made a mistake?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
100. Would you feel very sorry for an animal caught in a trap?\_\_\_\_\_YES NO
101. Do you think you are a well-organized person?
102. Are you always tidy?
103. Do you think you are always a reliable person?
104. Would you try to bribe a policeman to get out of trouble?
105. Would you sell a car to anyone knowing that it is in dangerous condition?
106. Do you worry about getting drunk when you drink?
107. Would you drive a car after drinking heavily?
108. Are you worried about the future?
109. Do you think that studying is a good idea?
110. If you travelled in a plane would you worry about crashing?
111. Do you think it is a good idea to have a gun for your own protection?
112. Would you lend money to a friend who had financial problems?
113. Did you mind filling in this form?

PLEASE CHECK TO SEE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS