

The Big Five Personality Framework: Insights and Critical Perspectives

Shalini Girdhar¹, Vinod K. Bhatnagar², Dr. Nandan Velankar³

¹Research Scholar, Jiwaji University, Gwalior, M. P

^{2,3}Associate Professor, Prestige Institute of Management & Research Centre, Gwalior, M.P

ABSTRACT

The Big Five Personality Framework is thoroughly and critically reviewed in this study, which also examines its conceptual underpinnings, empirical development, and applicability in a variety of fields. The Big Five, one of the most well-known and scientifically validated theories of personality, provides insightful information about individual variations in behavior, emotion, and thought. The meaning of each trait, the framework's historical development, the hierarchical structure of traits, disagreements over the number of dimensions, alternative theoretical stances, measurement tools, the connection between personality traits and performance, and the possibility of adding a sixth trait are the eight main themes around which this review summarizes important findings from a wide range of studies carried out across individuals, groups, and cultures. The results draw attention to persistent conceptual and methodological issues, especially the difficulties in using universal models in a variety of cultural situations. In order to improve the validity and application of the Big Five Personality Framework in subsequent research, the study's conclusion highlights the significance of culturally sensitive methodologies and improved assessment instruments.

Key words: Big five traits (BFT); BFT perspective; number of traits; religiosity; sixth trait JEL classification: M14

AN OVERVIEW

The big five characteristics (BFT) are the core of the theory of personality traits, which is one of the most significant theories of personality (Ewen 2003) for describing, interpreting, and forecasting human behavior. One of the richest areas for research and development is BFT (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and neuroticism or emotional stability). At least three significant factors contribute to this, including the fact that the BFT is the most well-known and commonly used model to explain the organization of personality traits (Rammstedt et al. 2010). The big five traits have been the subject of numerous research. Second, they encompass a wide range of personality-related characteristics, attitudes, and actions. Thirdly, because the BFT has a wide range of applications and is backed by a substantial body of empirical research, it can be a valuable foundation for extrapolating personality traits across situations and cultures (Krueger and Eaton 2010). Additionally, because personality traits are generally constant across time and in various contexts, they gain conceptual and practical significance. They have been correctly identified as mutually exclusive groups and are simple to comprehend. Additionally, the BFTs' comprehensibility and ease of memorization offer a chance for many people to comprehend human characteristics. Many languages, including Czech, Dutch, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Korean, and Polish (Widiger and Mullins-Sweatt 2005: p40), have been used to duplicate lexical investigations of personality traits (Rammstedt et al. 2010; Randy et al. 2008: p580). Twenty-eight languages were used to translate the BFT questionnaire from English (Schmitt et al. 2007). The BFTs theory has two benefits in this situation: First, comparison to the other five fundamental theories of personality: learning, cognitive learning, humanistic, psychoanalytic, and psychoanalytic-social (Cloninger 2004).

On the other hand, the BFT model stimulated the development of other big trait models such as two big traits (Robertson 1994), big three traits. dark triad, (Paulhus and Williams 2002), big four traits (Cloninger and Svrakic 1997), other big five traits (McAdams and Pals 2006), big six traits (Ashton et al. 2004; Ashton and Lee 2008), big seven traits, and ten traits (Paunonen 2002). The BFT has the ability to provide a valid and adequate framework to assess the personality's psychopathology (Bagby 2005). They also motivate other studies to adopt new five traits in the same field (McAdams and Pals 2006), and other traits (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness) in the brand personality

(Aaker 1997). The BFT model is often overused (Jang et al. 1996), and its superiority stems from the incorporation of a wider range of personality traits and scales (Aziz and Jackson 2001). Depending on the lexicon hypothesis of various languages, this model is currently the most widely used to describe the organization of personality (Goldberg 2001; Zhou et al. 2009). According to Saucier and Goldberg (1998), all personality qualities fall under the big five or can be included in them, meaning that neither the big five features nor their alternatives exist. This viewpoint also explains why numerous research have tried to supply additional qualities or even expand the number of big traits. The goal of this study is twofold: the first concentrates on eight observations and criticisms of the BFTs, while the second contains a thorough assessment of the literature on the BFT and the sixth trait that has been added to them, religiosity. This work is a conceptual research that identifies the essential observations on BFT through a critical review of the BFT. Methodologically, this study has been designed as follows: (i) providing a background on the BFT story (the importance of the BFT in personality theories); (ii) a presentation of critical observations on BFT through a thorough review of the literature; (iii) results and discussion; (iv) conclusions; and (v) limitations of the study.

An Account of the Big Five Characteristics

Man's personality is his biological and cultural blueprint, a special blend of environment and genetics. According to evolutionary theory, personality is a pattern of distinctive fusion of biology, psychology, and society through hitherto unheard-of overlap of social and natural selection to create the world of individuals. Even if our understanding of personality research has greatly advanced, it is still one of the most mysterious topics. The entire complex of human nature (heredity) and how it manifests itself in various personality configurations in various situations (culture) is known as personality. We believe that the theory of personality traits, and especially the BFT model, has simplified the enigma of personality in different contexts of analysis (Taylor 2009; Charles 2013). However, there are significant differences about the definition of a characteristic, and the concept of a trait is difficult to define (Carver and Scheier 2012: p53). As a result, any effort to enhance our understanding of personality and to improve our perceptions of it becomes crucial in the study of personality. According to Feldman (2013), the Five Big characteristics are the best way to describe personality in this context. They also seem to be the most fascinating way to express and interpret personality and are most helpful in characterizing individual and group differences. Over the past few decades, a number of BFT model components have been thoroughly examined. The meaning of the trait, the Big Five traits' history, the hierarchy of traits, the number of traits, three perspectives on BFT, questionnaires for the BFTs, factor structure, the BFTs and performance, and the sixth trait are some significant aspects of them that should be emphasized. These features are listed below.

Historiography

The language that served as a storehouse for the most extensive and varied features was the first step in creating the Big Five features. Thus, natural language adjectives served as the foundation for the creation of the Big Five. The most significant phenotypic characteristics are typically conveyed as single words in natural language, according to the lexical hypothesis (Goldberg 1981; Zhou et al. 2009). The lexical vision can take us back to Klages (1926) and Baumgarten (1933), claim John and Srivastava (1999). 18,000 terms were found in Allport and Odbert's study (1936), which was referenced in John and Srivastava (1999). This number dropped to 4,500 in Catell's study (1943), and then to 240 in Costa and McCrae's study (1992). The shift from lexical vision (dictionary terms and adjectives) to traits vision, where traits are focus points that express the common aspects of personality, is actually a significant advancement of BFT. Larsen and Buss (2014) acknowledge Fiske (1949) as the source of this discovery. The five qualities became widely accepted as one of the main theories of personality in the 1980s (Cloninger 2004). The BFT is currently one of the key theories for characterizing and analyzing personality. The methodological sources for personality research give BFT theory a lot of weight as a crucial area for the development of personality research. Lastly, even if the study and comprehension of personality have benefited from the five primary features, there is still more to the mystery of personality than can be explained by a single model or theory. This is demonstrated by the fact that as our knowledge of BFT studies and their application in personality research has grown, so too has criticism of these characteristics (Eysenck 1992; and McCrae 2009).

The Interpretation of Trait

A trait's definition must be established since it serves as the foundation for the study's interpretation of personality. Merriam Webster asserts that an individual's characteristics are what define and characterize them. It is a complicated mix of ethical and mental characteristics that identify and frequently distinguish an individual. A characteristic is a person's internal drive that commonly influences his conduct. A portion of the personality and associated behavior are summarized in a merely descriptive manner (Larsen, p. 59). It is a recurrent pattern of reaction to objects, situations, and occurrences. When it comes to explaining personality and behavior, this reaction pattern is the most important part of personality.

Cervone & Pervin (2013: p. 232) state that personality traits have two meanings: distinctiveness (traits determine the features which signify persons are different) and consistency (a regularity in the person's conduct). Personal characteristics have scientific significance in characterizing, analyzing, and forecasting human behavior because of these two implications.

According to McCrae and Costa (1997), a trait is "a person's typical style of thinking, feeling, and acting in different kinds of situations and at different times." According to Costa and McCrae (1988), each trait is a personality dimension that represents a crucial way in which people differ. Three presumptions form the foundation of personality trait theory. First, personality qualities don't change much over time. Second, they remain consistent in a variety of circumstances (Burger 2011: p.150). Cervone and Pervin (2013: p. 232) state that personality traits have two meanings: distinctiveness (traits determine the features which signify persons are different) and consistency (a regularity in the person's conduct). Personal characteristics have scientific significance in characterizing, analyzing, and forecasting human behavior because of these two implications. According to McCrae and Costa (1997), a trait is "a person's typical style of thinking, feeling, and acting in different kinds of situations and at different times." According to Costa and McCrae (1988), each trait is a personality dimension that represents a crucial way in which people differ. Three presumptions form the foundation of personality trait theory. First, personality qualities don't change much over time. Second, they remain consistent in a variety of circumstances. The phrase "black" or "white," which denotes the complete presence or complete absence of the feature, is not applicable to any trait. Rather, the trait can be distributed as several levels on a lengthy continuum that represents a variety of actions that show its availability in people. Because of this, no trait—whether it be agreeableness, extraversion, or something else entirely—is pure. In any event, when a trait is mostly present in contrast to those who considerably lack it, it can be a powerful predictor of personality as well as individual differences.

The Hierarchy of Traits

According to Eysenck's hierarchical view of dimensions, the big trait of extraversion, or the supertrait at the top level, consists of a number of traits, including dominance, sociability, liveliness, and activity. These traits in turn include a set of habits, which are also linked to particular stimuli and reactions (Carver and Scheier 2012: p. 58; Burger 2011: p. 224). The Big Five traits' hierarchy helps draw attention to the subtraits that become focus points as opposed to supertraits. Because the sub-traits are numerous and distinct from one another despite being sub-components of the same trait, this hierarchical structure therefore increases the complexity. These divisions and hierarchies increase complexity without necessarily improving our comprehension of personality. The Big Five features' initial development signifies a shift from viewing them as focal areas to understand personality traits and maybe predict behavior. The Big Five Traits were called by Goldberg (1992). He emphasized that there are many ways to interpret personality traits using each of these five features. Because of these general characteristics, Goldberg was more likely to employ the bipolar adjective scales, an alternative measurement technique. "The distribution of individuals on a continuum that tends to trait (such as extinctions) on the first side and extends on the same continuum to the other side to represent the other side of the trait (introversion) is clearly achieved by these bipolar traits, which help avoid a hierarchy of the trait on the one hand. Each trait's hierarchical structure aids in turning it into a focal point for characterizing personality. The bipolar adjective scales, on the other hand, cause people to be distributed throughout a broad continuum, indicating significant individual variances in each of the Big Five qualities.

The Quantity of Traits

Finding new traits or sub-traits has always been a trend. The authors are actually tempted by this research to add their own touches to the study of personality or consider other personality features that, in their opinion, are more significant. This raises the question of why there are the Big Five Traits and not any other number. In our research, the number five appears to appear and be utilized a lot. Five sources of power (Raven 1992), five wants in Maslow's Hierarchy of wants (1978), and five dimensions of national culture according to Hofstede (after introducing the fifth dimension under the influence of Confucianism). McCrae and John (1991) observe that the theory of BFT is unclear, and the quantity of features might be a historical coincidence. Some researchers like to employ a different number with the so-called plus or minus two features (Briggs 1989), which means raising the number, notwithstanding the importance of five in managerial studies.

Table 1. The Number of Personality Traits in Different Models

Two Big Personality Traits Wiggins (1968)	Extraversion- Anxiety	Many studies have confirmed both traits.
Two Big Personality Traits Robertson (1994)	Conscientiousness- Neuroticism	From the Big Five Traits (BFT), only these two traits have a positive effect on performance.
Eysenck's Three-Factor Model (1967, 1992)	Psychoticism- Extraversion- Neuroticism	These three of the five traits were intercorrelated but not all part of the BFT.

Big Five TraitsFiske (1949)	Extraversion- Agreeableness- Conscientiousness- Neuroticism- Openness	The transition from the lexical hypothesis to the practical hypothesis led to the development of the Big Five Traits (BFT).
Norman (1963)	Agreeableness- Neuroticism (Emotional Stability)- Conscientiousness- Culture–Intellect	Culture is broader as it is considered a super-trait, while openness to experience is treated as a specific trait.
Big Six Traits (HEXACO Model)Ashton et al. (2004); Ashton & Lee (2005); Ashton & Lee (2008); Lee & Ashton (2004); Leeb & Ashton (2014)	Big Five traits plus a sixth factor: Honesty–Humility	The HEXACO model provides a broader view of personality by extending the Big Five to include the dimension of honesty–humility, which also reflects aspects of religiosity and morality.

Table 2 Alternative Model of Personality Traits

Three Big TraitsCloninger et al. (1991); Cloninger et al. (1993)	Self-directedness- Cooperativeness- Self-transcendence	These three traits can predict interpersonal differences in responsiveness to experimental pain.
Four Big TraitsCloninger & Svrakic (1997)	Harm Avoidance- Novelty Seeking- Reward Dependence- Persistence	This is a biopsychological model where the four major traits are considered moderately stable throughout life.
The Temperament and Character Inventory – Revised (TCI-R) Cloninger et al. (1999)	Temperaments:- Novelty Seeking- Harm Avoidance- Reward Dependence- Persistence Characters:- Self-directedness- Cooperativeness- Self-transcendence	The TCI-R has been translated into multiple languages and validated across various cultural contexts, showing robust results and acceptable factor structures.
Big Six Traits Church & Katigbak (1989); Church & Katigbak (2002)	Social Potency- Responsibility- Emotional Control- Concern for Others- Broad-mindedness- Affective Well-being	These six traits were developed to describe and understand the Filipino personality structure.
Seven Big Traits (Hogan Personality Inventory – HPI)Hogan (1992)	Adjustment- Ambition- Sociability- Likeability- Prudence- Intellectance- School Success	The HPI measures normal personality in social interactions and its relationship with performance outcomes.
Alternative Five-Factor Model Zuckerman et al. (1991)	Impulsive Sensation Seeking- Aggression– Hostility- Activity- Sociability- Neuroticism– Anxiety	This model of personality traits does not include an equivalent to openness to experience.
Seven Domains of Personality (Temperament and Character Inventory – TCI)Cloninger (1994)	Harm Avoidance- Novelty Seeking- Reward Dependence- Persistence- Self-directedness- Cooperativeness- Self-transcendence	A revised biosocial model of personality where the first four traits represent temperament dimensions and the last three represent character domains.
Ten Clusters Beyond the Big Five Traits (BFT)Paunonen & Jackson (2000)	Religious- Deceptive- Ethical- Sexy- Thrifty- Conservative- Masculine–Feminine- Egotistical- Humorous- Risk Taking	These clusters demonstrate that the Big Five traits are not entirely comprehensive. Additional dimensions such as religiosity and ethics are important components of human personality.
Matthews & Oddy (1993)	Extraversion: Humorous, Amusing, Popular- Ambition: Hard-working, Productive, Determined- Creativity: Imaginative, Inventive, Original	This model expands upon the Big Five by emphasizing specific behavioral expressions of extraversion, ambition, and creativity.
Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI)Cheung et al. (1996)	Harmony- Ren Qing (Relationship Orientation)- Modernization- Thrift- Ah-Q Mentality (Defensiveness)- Graciousness- Trustworthiness- Face- Family Orientation- Somatization (Expression of Distress)	These ten traits can be grouped into four broader dimensions: Dependability, Chinese Tradition, Social Potency, and Individualism.

Psychopathology Five (PSY-5)Harkness & McNulty (1994); Harkness et al. (2002)	Aggressiveness- Psychoticism- Disconstraint- Negative Emotionality / Neuroticism- Introversion / Low Positive Emotionality	This model extends the Big Five framework into the domain of psychopathology, focusing on maladaptive personality traits related to psychological disorders.
---	--	--

Three Perspectives of the Big Five Traits

The etic approach, which holds that the Big Five traits are universal regardless of the environment, culture, or context, and the emic approach, which holds that the Big Five traits are specific to culture and context, have both been the subject of numerous studies (Gurven et al. 2013; Lodhi et al. 2002; Zhou et al. 2009; Triandis and Suh 2002; Cheung et al. 2011). It is a dilemma of specificity (various personality qualities according to different civilizations) or generality (the Big Five traits across cultures). We can identify three viewpoints to evaluate the characteristics of BFT in this analysis: A universal viewpoint absence spearheaded a bold movement to highlight the biological nature of the five characteristics. But his extensive research has validated three other characteristics that are also worth taking into account. This viewpoint holds that the Big Five qualities are a global language of personality, shared elements, and universal descriptions of personality in all contexts and cultures (Cheung et al. 1996; ChamorroPremuzic and Furnham 2010). This viewpoint aims to cultivate exogenous, imported, and generic personality qualities. In an effort to view these characteristics as biological features (McAdams and Pals 2006; DeYoung 2010; Zuckerman 1992) and cross-cultural qualities, proponents of the BFT model want to demonstrate their comprehensiveness and universality. As a result, these characteristics represent universal aspects of human nature rather than socioeconomic and cultural variables. Ultimately, from a local perspective, ecologies influence cultures, and cultures influence the development of personality traits (Triandis and Suh 2002). The significance of personality traits has been examined in the context of Western civilization, and the meanings of the BFT have been created within the framework of the English language's lexical hypothesis. Thus, according to Randy et al. (2008), Church and Katigbak (1989), and Church and Katigbak (2002), the BFT model can be viewed as a naive western view of personality based on context-free qualities. Additionally, Heine and Buchtel (2009) verified that the BFT model is more suitable for American participants and accurately reflects the English personality.

According to three studies (Krug and Kulhavy 1973; Cattell et al. 1970 and Plaut et al. 2002 in Rentfrow 2010), there are geographical variations as measured by the BFT. Numerous research on Korean, Indian, Mexican, Filipino, and Arabic cultures have revealed that these cultures have numerous unique characteristics that go beyond the BFT, with an emphasis on indigenous culture-specific traits and local factors in culture (Miserandino 2012: p. 51; Najm 2015). The majority of research has restricted the application of the BFT model to urban and literate populations (Gurven et al. 2013). As a result, there are issues with the validity, reliability, and questionnaire employed when applying these attributes across cultural boundaries, even when focusing on other important traits. Another factor that affects how individuals react to these characteristics is the reference-group effect, which is the propensity for people to react to objects in accordance with implicit standards from their culture (Heine et al. 2002; and Heine et al. 2008). As with other large traits (Cloninger 1994; Thornquist and Kiers 1991) and a different number of these qualities (ten attributes instead of five) (Cheung et al. 1996; and Raad 2009), applying the lexical hypothesis in Chinese can provide various results. In the context of Arabic language and culture, the same outcome can be verified. Karim et al. (2009) claim that when the BFT model was applied to assess personality traits in a local (or Islamic) setting, it failed. Mastor et al. (2000) found that two BFT traits—the extraversion and openness traits—were not clearly indicative of Malay personality. Religiosity is probably a large sixth trait, and other traits can be attained. This viewpoint aims to cultivate specific, contextual, and native personality qualities. Lastly, a local viewpoint can contribute to the study of personality in at least two ways. First, it can identify and embrace characteristics that are more suited to the group's culture, and these can offer greater behavioral predictions (Ashton and Lee 2008). The five qualities model of Islamic personality put forth by Othman et al. (2014) falls within this viewpoint. According to the third viewpoint, BFT is still debatable (Costa and McCrae 1992). While some research' findings highlighted the significance of cross-cultural characteristics (Gurven et al. 2013), others did not (McCrae and Costa 2003). Both generality (universality) and specificity (locality) have some empirical support, and their respective influences were roughly equal, according to Eysenck (1998: p. 15). As a result, there is still need for more empirical research on the Big Five features to deepen our understanding of them and make them more universal and comprehensive.

This work fits into a third perspective that adds the sixth trait—religiosity—to the BFT model, combining generality and specificity. Regarding the three viewpoints, it is evident that there has been a significant inclination to turn BFT into universal characteristics with biological foundations that are shared by all people, regardless of culture, as well as by non-human entities. Zuckerman (1991) tended to take biological traits into account when identifying four key traits. According to this viewpoint, all personality variations are biological and stem from genes (DeYoung, 2010: p. 1166). The Big Five

characteristics are crucial for understanding personality, but they must be viewed from a psycho-social perspective rather than a biological one.

Big Five Traits & Performance

The antecedents of performance are the characteristics in the BFT model. However, these characteristics can have an impact on performance when people are involved in their work. As a result, significant queries concerning their relationship can be raised. Is it possible to think of performance as a function of the BFT features (performance = $\Psi(\text{BFT})$)? Do high performance and the BFT have a causal relationship? The answer depends on these personality qualities in connection to other factors, but it is not definitive. All BFT qualities are positively correlated with performance and financial success throughout life, according to numerous research (Amir et al. 2014). According to Chamorro Premuzic and Furnham (2010), the BFT is a reliable indicator of performance. Job preferences can be ascertained using big five traits models such as Holland's theory of interests and his six personality types (RIASEC) (Armstrong et al. 2008). A positive correlation between all or some qualities and improved performance has been confirmed by other research (Echchakoui 2013; Hogan and Holland 2003; Hurtz and Donovan 2000; Mount and Barrick 1995; Salgado 1997). Additionally, some research has shown that some (but not all) of these characteristics are positively correlated. Only two traits—conscientiousness and neuroticism or emotional stability—are associated with the best performance, according to Robertson's study from 2001.

The other three traits—openness, agreeableness, and extraversion—do not contribute to improved performance. Only three characteristics—conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion—have been linked to team effectiveness in fifteen research, according to Rothstein and Goffin (2006). Religious principles and ideals can be used to support or contradict personal preferences (Baron 2014). This implies that people also apply their religious principles and beliefs while addressing performance or management standards. Even while these encouraging results indicate a complete or partial association between BFT and performance, other research has found no such relationship. In contrast to conscientiousness, extraversion and job performance are correlated, according to a study by Robie et al. (2005). Murphy and Dziewieczynski (2005) noted that there is extremely little, almost no, association between any BFT and job performance. Additionally, Hough's (2011) research demonstrates that the BFT are poor performance predictors. Lastly, it is not possible to view the relationship between the FBTs and performance as entirely good. In any event, the favorable correlation between performance and some personality qualities might be disregarded.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Eight significant observations about the BFT model have been confirmed by this study: definitions of the traits, the BFT's history, the unity or hierarchy of traits, the number of traits, three perspectives on the BFT, BFT questionnaires, BFT and performance, and the necessity of a sixth trait. The spread of one model to many human groups regardless of environmental, ethnic, and cultural diversity is the most dangerous aspect of universalizing a single model to describe human personality across borders and cultures, as these eight issues highlight. Despite numerous challenges, the BFT model has been an ambitious endeavor to offer a single, global explanation of the human psyche that transcends geography, history, and cultural variety. In response to these criticisms, the researchers created alternative models with different personality qualities and varying numbers of traits (the big two, three, four, five, six, seven, and ten traits, as indicated in Table 1) that differ from the model's golden number of five. However, the concept is invalid in the setting of non-Anglo-Saxon languages and cultures when used in other nations. However, the concept is invalid in the setting of non-Anglo-Saxon languages and cultures when used in other nations. Numerous research carried out in various nations, including Poland, the Czech Republic, Turkey, the Netherlands, Italy, Hungary, South Korea, the Philippines, Spain, Germany, France, Japan, and Taiwan, have verified this (Saucier and Goldberg 2001; Rolland 2002).

The assessment of the BFT model is often perceived as an Anglo-Saxon cultural perspective. China has offered more character features and descriptions of Chinese personalities from various parts of the world. In Zhou et al.'s 2009 study, 3,159 lexical phrases were found to characterize Chinese personality; the top 413 terms with the highest frequency were used. Other characteristics that overlap with those in the BFT model have been verified by the study's findings. By presenting the qualities as more widely accepted personality descriptions, the BFT model helped to the development of a thorough and somewhat universal theory of personality. The BFT model is one of the most significant theories of personality due to the scientific contributions made by numerous researchers over many years. Understanding the BFT model in light of the "Barnum effect," which states that "people were quick to trust a test that gave general statements about their personalities" (Snyder et al. 1977), helped explain why BFT was so successful and well-liked. The main conclusion is that different cultural situations, different questionnaires, and different instruments to measure attributes might provide different results. This issue is present in the BFT model and is more noticeable in other models that make use of different personality qualities. Although the development of several personality trait models, facets of each trait, and questionnaires has enhanced the study of personality, it also makes it challenging to examine and assess the vast array of models, traits,

and facets. These issues are linked to the problems in determining which personality traits are most representative. As a result, the two extremes in this area must be avoided. On the one hand, there is a model that is not generalizable, and on the other, there are other models that add to the intricacy of this scientific subject and diminish the possibility of using them to comprehend a complicated and perplexing matter like personality. Similar to the "Periodic Table of Chemical Elements," the ambitious goal of the global perspective of BFT has led to the creation of a "Periodic Table of Personality" that is applicable to all people, independent of their culture (Woods and Anderson 2016; and Lamiell 2000). This viewpoint holds that, analogous to chemical elements that are found everywhere in nature, all people share some values, feelings, and actions regardless of their cultures or settings. This study makes it abundantly evident that this viewpoint is overly simplistic, and a one-size-fits-all solution looks to lack the profound meaning of human diversity, which manifests in many domains beyond biological variability. In summary, a person's personality is shaped by a mixture of two factors: environmental-cultural factors, which vary depending on cultural diversity, and genetic factors, which are shared by all individuals (Burger 2011: p.13).

Thus, developing a variety of personality traits that adapt to different settings and cultures can be seen as a significant enhancement of cross-cultural interpersonal understanding. Numerous statistical techniques, including EFA, PCA, CFA, and Factor analysis-verbatim, were employed in the testing of BFT; however, the inconsistent results (some positive, some negative) raised questions about the universality of these traits and the necessity of developing them, including the creation of alternative models. The results are not definitive and have not produced trustworthy empirical evidence, despite the numerous studies and statistical techniques employed (Rentfrow 2010; Larsen and Buss 2014). With reference to the questionnaires employed in the BFT model, the same observation can be verified because different questionnaires may yield different results or even results that are impossible to repeat. Additionally, the people involved in corporate policy planning to evaluate the impact of these characteristics on workers' performance according to their internal and external environment, given the lack of a causal relationship between all five measures and the various outcomes of the relationship between the five characteristics and performance. The BFT model was created during a time when psychology had long removed itself from religion and religiosity. The fact that religion has always been a last resort for people searching for a great light and the Four Noble Truths (Van Gordon et al. 2015; Thera 2014), for a supernatural hope that might be the only way out of despair (Durant and Durant 1968: p. 43), and for perfecting the noblest morals (makarim alakhlaq) (Prophetic Hadith from Islam) has not been diminished by human civilization's ups and downs. Psychology is becoming more aware of religious interest, much like other disciplines like economics (McCleary and Barro, 2006; McCleary and Barro, 2003). This study supports the recognition of religiosity as a sixth trait, especially in the study of Arab and Islamic personalities, since religion is one of the pillars of personality interpretation (Mohd Mahudin et al. 2016; Osman-Gani et al. 2003; Othman et al. 2014). Religion, religiosity, spirituality, religious beliefs, and other characteristics pertaining to man's spiritual needs are one facet of personality that cannot be ignored.

CONCLUSIONS

The following are some inferences that can be made from researching the BFT model: The lexical hypothesis has demonstrated that the inventory of dictionary features to find adjectival clusters of these traits can uncover additional traits that the model was unable to include in various nations. According to Paunonen and Jackson (2000), characteristics (adjectival clusters) other than BFT can be taken into account. In the Zhao study, for instance, the Chinese dictionary—which represents the nation's entire treasure of the national language—explained that there are additional distinct features (ten traits instead of five) that represent clusters of Chinese adjectives. Any national language in other nations and areas may be affected by this outcome. The BFT model is not the only model that can explain personality traits across national boundaries and cultural contexts. These characteristics are not constant across all research and are not universal. This explains why the significance of these five qualities varies from culture to culture and even within a single civilization. The typical reductionist perspective, which uses a single model to capture and explain personality qualities in all contexts and cultures, was significantly addressed by researchers who created multiple models of character traits rather than just one. Despite using appropriate statistical techniques like exploratory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and the factor structure, the results of BFT tests were inconsistent in many studies (Othman et al. 2014). In other words, these tests supported certain traits while not supporting others (Robertson, 1994; Mastor et al. 2000). Only two traits—neuroticism and extraversion—were more stable over time in the Costa and McCrae study (1985); the other three were not.

The model was criticized as a result of these findings (McCrae and John, 1991; Eysenck 1992; Rolland 2002), and these findings may have influenced researchers' inclination to create alternative models. One of the most significant characteristics that the BFT model has overlooked is religiosity. Despite the long-standing conflict with religion that started in the fourteenth century with the Renaissance and continued through the eighteenth century with the industrial revolution and the twentieth century with the secular age and all of its many impacts (Taylor, 2007). Atheistic and antireligious communism, the tyranny of material values, and the dominance of market laws on our thoughts and behaviors under the

influence of "Monsters of the market: Zombies, vampires and global capitalism" (McNally 2011) and "Profit above people" (Chomsky 2003) are further factors. Despite this, religion continues to be a source of moral principles, a man's final line of defense against trying situations and a way to defuse tense situations, and religiosity continues to be a significant personality test. Therefore, it is crucial to expand the model by incorporating religiosity as a sixth trial.

LIMITATIONS

This study has certain drawbacks that are worth mentioning. Since this study is conceptual in nature, it has drawn on previous research to pinpoint significant findings on the BFT model. As a result, the study offers proof based on several studies conducted by researchers and the qualitative evaluation of these studies' findings. This has been accomplished without performing a pilot research, quantitative analysis, or comparisons between the findings of these investigations and the outcomes that can be obtained when accounting for the significant observations made by this study. Based on quantitative analysis and comparison of their research, this study may encourage researchers to utilize these significant findings in subsequent experimental investigations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347–356.
- [2] Achour, M., & Boerhannoeddin, A. B. (2011). The role of religiosity as a coping strategy in coping with work-family conflict: The case of Malaysian women in academia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1(1), 80–85.*
- [3] Achour, M., Mohd Nor, M. R., & Yusoff, Y. Z. M. (2015). Islamic personal religiosity as a moderator of job strain and employee well-being: The case of Malaysian academic and administrative staff. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 54(2).
- [4] Al-Goaib, S. (2003). Religiosity and social conformity of university students: An analytical study applied at King Saoud University. *Arts Journal of King Saoud University*, 16(1), 51–99.*
- [5] Allen, B. P. (2006). *Personality theories: Development, growth, and diversity*. Routledge.
- [6] Aluja, A., Blanch, A., Gallart, S., & Dolcet, M.-J. (2010). The Temperament and Character Inventory-Revised (TCI-R): Descriptive and factor structure in different age levels. *Behavioral Psychology*, 18(2), 385–401.*
- [7] Aluja, A., & Blanch, A. (2011). The five and seven factors personality models: Differences and similarities between the TCI-R, NEO-FFI-R, and ZKPQ-50-CC. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14(2), 659–666.*
- [8] Amir, F., Naz, F., Hafeez, S. Q., Ashfaq, A., & Dogar, Y. H. (2014). Measuring the effect of Five-Factor Model of personality on team performance with moderating role of employee engagement. *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 2(2), 221–255.*
- [9] Armstrong, P. I., Day, S. X., McVay, J. P., & Rounds, J. (2008). Holland's RIASEC model as an integrative framework for individual differences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(1), 1–18.*
- [10] Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Goldberg, L. R. (2004). A hierarchical analysis of 1,710 English personality-descriptive adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(5), 707–721.*
- [11] Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty–Humility, the Big Five, and the Five-Factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 73(5), 1321–1353.*
- [12] Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty–Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(5), 1216–1228.*
- [13] Aziz, S., & Jackson, C. J. (2001). A comparison between three- and five-factor models of Pakistani personality data. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(8), 1311–1319.*
- [14] Bagby, R. M., Costa, P. T. Jr., Widiger, T. A., Fyder, A. G., & Marshall, M. (2005). DSM-IV personality disorders and the Five-Factor model of personality: A multi-method examination of domain- and facet-level predictions. *European Journal of Personality*, 19(4), 307–324.*
- [15] Baron, J. (2014). Moral judgment. In E. Zamir & D. Teichman (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Behavioral Economics and the Law* (pp. 61–92). Oxford University Press.
- [16] Briggs, S. R. (1989). The optimal level of measurement of personality constructs. In D. M. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.), *Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging directions* (pp. 246–260). Springer-Verlag.
- [17] Burger, J. M. (2011). *Personality*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, Cengage Learning.
- [18] Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2012). *Perspectives on personality*. In M. R. Barrick & M. K. Mount (Eds.), *The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis* (pp. 1–26). *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1).
- [19] Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF)*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability.
- [20] Cervone, D., & Pervin, L. A. (2013). *Personality: Theory and research*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- [21] Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2010). *The psychology of personnel selection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Charles, D. (2013). *The personality puzzle*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- [23] Cheung, F. M., Song, W. Z., & Zhang, J. X. (1996). The Chinese MMPI-2: Research and applications in Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China. In J. N. Butcher (Ed.), *International adaptations of the MMPI-2: A handbook of research and applications* (pp. 137–161). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- [24] Cheung, F. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist*, 66(7), 593–603.*
- [25] Chomsky, N., & McChesney, R. W. (2003). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- [26] Church, A. T., & Katigbak, M. S. (1989). Internal, external, and self-report structure of personality in a non-Western culture: An investigation of cross-language and cross-cultural generalizability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 857–872.*
- [27] Church, A. T., & Burke, P. (1994). Exploratory and confirmatory tests of the Big Five and Tellegen's three- and four-dimensional models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 93–114.*
- [28] Church, A. T., & Katigbak, M. S. (2002). Studying personality traits across cultures: Philippine examples. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1039>
- [29] Cloninger, C. R., Przybeck, T. R., & Svrakic, D. M. (1991). The Three-Dimensional Personality Questionnaire: U.S. normative data. *Psychological Reports*, 69(3), 1047–1057.*
- [30] Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50(12), 975–990.*
- [31] Cloninger, C. R. (1994). Temperament and personality. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 4(2), 266–273.*
- [32] Cloninger, C. R., & Svrakic, D. M. (1997). Integrative psychobiological approach to psychiatric assessment and treatment. *Psychiatry*, 60(2), 120–141.*
- [33] Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., Bayón, C., & Przybeck, T. R. (1999). Measurement of psychopathology as variants of personality. In C. R. Cloninger, D. M. Svrakic, C. Bayón, & T. R. Przybeck (Eds.), *Personality and psychopathology* (pp. 21–40). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- [34] Cloninger, S. C. (2004). *Theories of personality: Understanding persons*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [35] Feldman, R. S. (2013). *Essentials of understanding psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- [36] Gebauer, J. E., Leidorn, B. W., Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., Lamb, M. E., & Potter, J. (2014). Cross-cultural variations in Big Five relationships with religiosity: A sociocultural motives perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(6), 1064–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a003768>.
- [37] Georgia, C.-S. (2013). Rules and Hofstede's UAI: A study on the Arabic Muslim and European Christian cultures. *Journal of Global Politics and Current Diplomacy*, 1(1), 79–90.
- [38] Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2010). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3–28). New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- [39] Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 141–165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- [40] Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>.
- [41] Gurven, M. R., von Rueden, C., Massenkoff, M., Kaplan, H., & Vie, M. L. (2013). How universal is the Big Five? Testing the Five-Factor Model of personality variation among forager–farmers in the Bolivian Amazon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 354–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030841>.
- [42] Gutiérrez-Zotes, J. A., Bayón, C., Montserrat, C., Valero, J., Labad, A., Cloninger, C. R., & Fernández-Aranda, F. (2004). Temperament and Character Inventory Revised (TCI-R): Standardization and normative data in a general population sample. *Actas Españolas de Psiquiatría*, 32(1), 8–15.*
- [43] Harkness, A. R., & McNulty, J. L. (1994). The Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5): Issues from the pages of a diagnostic manual instead of a dictionary. In S. Strack & M. Lorr (Eds.), *Differentiating normal and abnormal personality* (pp. 291–315). New York, NY: Springer.
- [44] Harkness, A. R., McNulty, J. L., Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Graham, J. R. (2002). *The Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5) Scales: Gaining an overview for case conceptualization and treatment planning*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- [45] Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Peng, K., & Greenholtz, J. (2002). What's wrong with cross-cultural comparisons of subjective Likert scales? The reference-group effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 903–918. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.903>.

- [46] Hills, P., Francis, L. J., Argyle, M., & Jackson, C. J. (2004). Primary personality trait correlates of religious practice and orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(1), 61–73. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00051-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00051-5).
- [47] Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). Confucius and economic growth: New trends in culture's consequences. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 4–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(88\)90009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(88)90009-5).
- [48] Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- [49] John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory (Versions 4a and 54)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- [50] John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- [51] Johnson, J. A. (2014). Measuring thirty facets of the five-factor model with a 120-item public domain inventory: Development of the IPIP-NEO-120. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51, 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003>.
- [52] Karim, N. S. A., Zamzuri, N. H. A., & Nor, Y. M. (2009). Exploring the relationship between internet ethics in university students and the Big Five model of personality. *Computers & Education*, 53(1), 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.01.001>
- [53] Krueger, R. F., & Eaton, N. R. (2010). Personality traits and the classification of mental disorders: Toward a more complete integration in DSM–5 and an empirical model of psychopathology. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 1(2), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018993>.
- [54] Lamiell, J. T. (2000). A periodic table of personality elements? The “Big Five” and trait psychology in critical perspective. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 20(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0091199>.
- [55] Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2014). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature* (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
- [56] Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 329–358. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8.
- [57] Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>
- [58] Lodhi, P. H., Deo, S. V., & Belhekar, V. M. (Year missing).
- [59] McCrae, R. R. (2002). NEO-PI-R data from 36 cultures: Further intercultural comparisons. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The five-factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 105–126). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.
- [60] McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51–87). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- [61] McNally, D. (2011). *Monsters of the market: Zombies, vampires and global capitalism*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- [62] Miserandino, M. (2012). *Personality psychology: Foundations and findings*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [63] Mohd Mahudin, N. D., Mohd Noor, N., Dzulkifli, M. A., & Janon, N. S. (2016). Religiosity among Muslims: A scale development and validation study. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 20(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v20i2.3498>.
- [64] Murphy, K. R., & Dzieweczynski, J. L. (2005). Why don't measures of broad dimensions of personality perform better as predictors of job performance? *Human Performance*, 18(4), 343–357. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1804_2.
- [65] Najm, A. N. (2015). Arab culture dimensions in the international and Arab models. *American Journal of Business, Economics and Management*, 3(6), 423–431.*
- [66] Nasution, M. E. (2009). Islamic spirit and moral in economics. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*, 15(1–2), 113–124.*
- [67] Nelson, R. (2006). *Economics as religion: From Samuelson to Chicago and beyond*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- [68] Njus, D. M., & Bane, C. M. H. (2009). Religious identification as a moderator of evolved sexual strategies of men and women. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(6), 546–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490902878912>
- [69] Osman-Gani, A. M., Hashim, J., & Yusof, I. (2013). Establishing linkages between religiosity and spirituality on employee performance. *Employee Relations*, 35(4), 360–376. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2012-0030> (add DOI if available)
- [70] Othman, A. K., Hamzah, M. I., & Hashim, N. (2014). Conceptualizing the Islamic personality model. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 130, 114–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.014> (add DOI if available)

- [71] Panayiotou, G., Kokkinos, C. M., & Spanoudis, G. (2004). Searching for the Big Five in a Greek context: The NEO-FFI under the microscope. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8), 1841–1854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.07.003> (add DOI if available)
- [72] Paunonen, S. V., & Jackson, D. N. (2000). What is beyond the Big Five? Plenty! *Journal of Personality*, 68(5), 821–835. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00117> (add DOI if available)
- [73] Plaut, V. C., Markus, H. R., & Lachman, M. E. (2002). Place matters: Consensual features and regional variation in American well-being and self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(1), 160–184. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.160>
- [74] Raad, B. D. (2009). Structural models of personality. In P. J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 127–147). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [75] Rammstedt, B., Goldberg, L. R., & Borg, I. (2010). The measurement equivalence of Big-Five factor markers for persons with different levels of education. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(1), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.10.005>
- [76] Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- [77] Snyder, C. R., Shenkel, R. J., & Lowery, C. R. (1977). Acceptance of personality interpretations: The Barnum effect and beyond. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45(1), 104–114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.45.1.104> (add DOI if available)
- [78] Stendorf, F., & Angleitner, A. (1994). A comparison of different instruments proposed to measure the Big Five. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 44(1), 45–55.*
- [79] Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- [80] Taylor, E. (2009). *The mystery of personality: A history of psychodynamic theories*. San Francisco, CA: Springer.
- [81] Thera, N. (2014). *The heart of Buddhist meditation*. San Francisco, CA: Weiser Books.
- [82] Toates, F. M. (2011). *Biological psychology*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- [83] Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 133–160. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135200>
- [84] Woods, S. A., & Anderson, N. R. (2016). Toward a periodic table of personality: Mapping personality scales between the five-factor model and the circumplex model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(4), 582–604. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000072> (add DOI if available)
- [85] Zhou, X., Saucier, G., Gao, D., & Liu, J. (2009). The factor structure of Chinese personality terms. *Journal of Personality*, 77(2), 363–399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00552.x> (add DOI if available)
- [86] Zuckerman, M. (1992). What is a basic factor and which factors are basic? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6), 675–681. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90237-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90237-J) (add DOI if available)
- [87] Zullig, K. J., Ward, R. M., & Horn, T. (2006). The association between perceived spirituality, religiosity, and life satisfaction: The mediating role of self-rated health. *Social Indicators Research*, 79(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-4127-5> (add DOI if available)