

Persons, Places, and Personality: Career Assessment Using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory

*Paul T. Costa, Jr. and Robert R. McCrae
Gerontology Research Center, National Institute on Aging, NIH
Baltimore, Maryland*

*Gary G. Kay
Georgetown University*

The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992a) is a questionnaire measure of 30 traits that define the comprehensive five-factor model (FFM) of personality. Data from police selection, college student, and Hispanic American samples illustrate the psychometric properties of the instrument. In vocational counseling, the NEO PI-R can supplement measures of vocational interests and abilities, especially by calling attention to the client's strengths and weaknesses in adjustment and motivation. Use of the NEO Job Profiler, a tool designed to help identify the personality requirements of different occupations, is illustrated in the police selection sample. Together, the NEO Job Profiler and NEO PI-R can help determine the optimal match between person and occupation.

One of the basic goals of career assessment is to develop a science and technology for optimally matching individuals with careers. In vocational counseling, the resulting information is used to identify occupations that will be personally rewarding to the client; in industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology, the same information might be used to select or place effective employees. These two goals sometimes conflict—particularly when the individual's interests do not correspond to his or her aptitudes—but, in general, fitting the person to the place benefits both employee and employer (Schneider, 1987).

From a general theoretical perspective, that matching problem involves a consideration of the capacities and needs of the individual as well as the

The authors thank Dr. Marc Gellman, University of Miami, for collecting data on the Spanish Edition of the NEO PI-R, Dr. Ralph L. Piedmont for permission to reproduce student data, and Drs. John L. Holland, Ralph L. Piedmont, and Mark J. Schmit for helpful comments on an earlier draft.

The NEO PI-R Spanish Edition, Interpretive Report, and NEO Software System are published by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., Odessa, FL.

Address correspondence to Paul T. Costa, Jr., Laboratory of Personality and Cognition, Gerontology Research Center, 4940 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21224.

In the public domain.

demands and opportunities of the environment. By and large, career counselors have relied on measures of vocational interests (e.g., Holland, 1985) as the basis of career counseling; personnel psychologists have concentrated on ability testing guided by task-oriented job analyses. This Special Issue is devoted to a consideration of a third category of variables, personality traits, and their relevance to career assessment. In this article we describe the NEO PI-R, a contemporary trait measure, as well as the NEO Job Profiler, a research tool that may prove useful in identifying personality traits relevant to a specific occupation.

Personality and Its Assessment

By *personality* we mean the relatively enduring styles of thinking, feeling, and acting that characterize an individual. These characteristics are familiar in everyday life, where we describe ourselves and our acquaintances with such terms as *nervous*, *energetic*, *original*, *accommodating*, or *careful*. In contrast to specific learned behaviors, personality traits are general tendencies that should be reflected in many aspects of a person's life, including vocational preferences, career choices, and job performance.

Although personality traits have been studied for decades, there have been major advances in recent years (Deary & Matthews, 1993). Most important has been the widespread recognition that almost all personality traits can be understood in terms of five basic dimensions—Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C)—that constitute the five-factor model (FFM) of personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae, 1992). Variations on these constructs have been identified in a wide variety of personality systems, as shown in Table 1 (Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Livi, 1994; Church, 1994; Conn & Rieke, 1994; Costa & McCrae, 1988; McCrae, 1988; McCrae & Costa, 1989). Because the FFM is comprehensive, it permits systematic studies of many topics and facilitates integrative reviews in which research using many different trait measures can be synthesized (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

From this perspective, the content validity of any personality inventory can be gauged by the adequacy with which it covers the full range of traits identified in the FFM. Personality instruments developed before the recent consensus on personality structure often lack measures of one or more factors. For example, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) has no measure of N (McCrae & Costa, 1989), whereas the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) lacks scales related to O (Goldberg & Rosolack, 1994). The NEO PI-R was specifically developed to operationalize the FFM.

The fact that traits can be grouped into five domains does not mean that the enterprise of personality assessment has been reduced to the estimation of five scores. For many purposes, the detailed information provided by more specific traits is crucial. For example, both intellectual curiosity and aesthetic sensitivity are aspects of the domain of Openness to Experience, but the former is a better predictor of investigative vocational interests, the latter of artistic interests (Costa, McCrae, & Holland, 1984). The NEO PI-R, therefore, assesses 30 specific traits, or facets, that define the five factors.

Table 1
Selected Questionnaire Scales Associated With the Five Basic Personality Factors

Questionnaire	Factor				
	N	E	O	A	C
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (McCrae & Costa, 1989)		Extroversion	Intuition	Feeling	Judging
California Psychological Inventory (McCrae, 1988)	low Well-being; low Good Impression	Sociability; Dominance	Achievement via Independence; Flexibility		Achievement via Conformance; Norm-Favoring
16PF Fifth Edition (Conn & Rieke, 1994)	Anxiety	Extraversion	low Tough-Mindedness	low Independence	Self-Control
Personality Research Form (Costa & McCrae, 1988)	Succorance; Defence	Exhibition; Affiliation	Sentience; Understanding	Nurturance; Abasement	Endurance; Cognitive Structure
Comrey Personality Scales (Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Livi, 1994)	low Emotional Stability	Activity; Extraversion		Trust; Empathy	Orderliness
Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (Church, 1994)	Stress Reaction	Social Closeness	Absorption	low Aggression	Achievement

Note. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness to Experience; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. Empty cells indicate that no scale was strongly associated with the factor.

Table 2 lists the facet scales; their labels indicate the nature and scope of the domains. Behavioral descriptions of the 30 constructs in a vocational context are given in the items of the NEO Job Profiler, a research tool reproduced in the Appendix and described later in this article.

Table 2 also provides information on psychometric properties of the instrument from recent studies in three samples of interest: job applicants, college students, and Hispanic Americans. Internal consistency is reported there for a sample of applicants for state, county, and metropolitan police positions who completed the NEO PI-R as part of selection procedures (although these data were not, in fact, used for selection purposes). This sample—to which we will return later—shows how well the instrument functions under the potentially biasing influences of a selection context. Internal consistencies for the five global domain scores are uniformly high; they are understandably lower for the facet scales, reflecting both their brevity (8 items) and a lack of redundancy in item content.

One of the unique features of the NEO PI-R is the availability of an observer rating version (Form R), as well as the more familiar self-report version (Form S). Agreement across observers provides powerful multimethod evidence of scale validity (McCrae, 1982). In the second column of Table 2, a recent study is summarized in which self-reports from college students were correlated with mean ratings from two informants (Piedmont, 1994). All five domains and all 30 facets have validity coefficients over .30, a value that was once thought to represent the upper limit of validity in personality assessment. These data replicate findings in older adults (Costa & McCrae, 1992b) and support the use of both forms of the NEO PI-R.

Counselors concerned with the appropriateness of personality instruments for diverse samples will be encouraged to know that the psychometric properties of the NEO PI-R appear to be similar in men and women, older and younger respondents, and White and non-White populations (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991). Recently a Spanish Edition of the NEO PI-R has been published for use with Spanish-speaking individuals in the United States. A comparability study examined scores on the English and Spanish editions for bilingual Hispanics who completed both versions. The third column of Table 2 reports correlations (uncorrected for retest unreliability) that are impressively high. Additional analyses showed no consistent evidence of mean level differences, suggesting that the two versions are essentially equivalent. Comparability across subcultures is not surprising given the now considerable evidence for cross-cultural validity of the NEO PI-R (McCrae, Costa, & Yik, in press).

The last five columns of Table 2 show results of a principal components analysis of the 30 facet scales in the police selection sample. Six factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0, but a scree test clearly indicated five factors. Varimax rotation provided a relatively good fit to the intended structure: Congruence coefficients between the varimax factors and factors in the normative sample (Costa & McCrae, 1992a) ranged from .91 to .95, and 24 of the 30 facets had their highest loading on the intended factor. A better estimate of the true replicability of factor structure, however, is provided by a targeted rotation (Costa, McCrae, Bond, & Paunonen, 1994); the results

of such a rotation are presented in Table 2. In this rotation, 28 of the facets have their primary loading on the intended factor, and the pattern of secondary loadings is very similar to that seen in the NEO PI-R normative sample (cf. Montag & Levin, 1994). These structural findings are of particular importance, given some previous indications that the FFM might not be recoverable in job applicant samples (Schmit & Ryan, 1993).

The validity of NEO PI-R scales as measures of personality in normal and clinical samples is extensively documented elsewhere (Costa & McCrae, 1992a; Costa & Widiger, 1994). There is also growing evidence that the NEO PI-R is useful in understanding vocational behavior. For example, Piedmont and Weinstein (1993) reported that employees' NEO PI-R scores were appropriately related to supervisors' ratings of their personality. McDaniel (1992) found that effective change leaders in a large West Coast electronics firm were, as hypothesized, higher on NEO PI-R Openness. Salgado and Rumbo (1994), using a Castilian version of the NEO PI-R's short form, the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI; Costa & McCrae, 1992a), found that Conscientiousness predicted job aspiration, attitude, and performance among financial services managers in Spain.

Personality and Vocational Counseling

Traits, Interests, and Abilities

Conceptually, personality traits have traditionally been distinguished from both interests and abilities. Traits are enduring dispositions that show evidence of considerable genetic influence (Loehlin, 1992); interests, including vocational interests, are potentially more malleable and are surely acquired in interaction with the environment. Yet, psychologists have known for decades that vocational interests are, in fact, extraordinarily stable (Strong, 1951), and links between personality traits and vocational interests have long been postulated, most notably in the work of John Holland (1973). How are traits related to interests?

Several recent studies have confirmed that there are consistent associations between certain personality traits and classes of vocational interests (Costa, Fozard, & McCrae, 1977; Gottfredson, Jones, & Holland, 1993; Schinka, Haley, & Dye, 1994). Data relating a precursor of the NEO PI-R to Holland's (1985) Self-Directed Search showed that Investigative and Artistic interests were positively related to Openness to Experience, whereas Conventional interests were negatively related to Openness. Both Social and Enterprising interests were related to Extraversion. In later analyses (Costa, McCrae, & Dembroski, 1989), we showed that Social interests (but not Enterprising interests) were associated with Agreeableness. We would interpret these associations to mean that individuals with particular personality traits are likely to develop interests in those vocations that permit the expression of their preferred ways of thinking, feeling, and acting (McCrae & Costa, in press).

But traits and interests are not isomorphic. As Gottfredson and colleagues (1993) noted, correlations between interest and personality trait measures are not high enough to suggest that one can be substituted for the other. Further,

Table 2
 Psychometric Characteristics of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory in Police Selection, College Student, and Hispanic Samples

NEO PI-R scale	Alpha	Cross-observer	Cross-language	Factor					
				N	E	O	A	C	
Domains:									
N: Neuroticism	.91	.54***	.93***						
E: Extraversion	.84	.63***	.93***						
O: Openness to Experience	.87	.53***	.91***						
A: Agreeableness	.87	.61***	.92***						
C: Conscientiousness	.90	.61***	.95***						
Facets:									
N1: Anxiety	.68	.57***	.85***	72					
N2: Angry Hostility	.74	.56***	.84***	67			-44		
N3: Depression	.70	.43***	.84***	75					
N4: Self-Consciousness	.56	.34***	.86***	71					
N5: Impulsiveness	.71	.41***	.73***	63					
N6: Vulnerability	.80	.33***	.85***	61				-44	
E1: Warmth	.69	.43***	.87***		62		44		
E2: Gregariousness	.68	.57***	.82***		64				
E3: Assertiveness	.69	.57***	.90***		43				
E4: Activity	.56	.52***	.83***		44			46	
E5: Excitement Seeking	.64	.44***	.88***		63				
E6: Positive Emotions	.69	.53***	.85***		61				
O1: Fantasy	.72	.44***	.83***			60			
O2: Aesthetics	.80	.58***	.87***			80			
O3: Feelings	.63	.37***	.69***		61				
O4: Actions	.58	.40***	.83***			53			
O5: Ideas	.83	.36***	.88***			81			
O6: Values	.56	.53***	.86***			51			

(continued)

Table 2 (Continued)
 Psychometric Characteristics of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory in Police Selection, College Student, and Hispanic Samples

NEO PI-R scale	Alpha	Cross-observer	Cross-language	Factor				
				N	E	O	A	C
A1: Trust	.80	.49***	.89***				55	
A2: Straightforwardness	.71	.40***	.82***				71	
A3: Altruism	.71	.39***	.85***				63	
A4: Compliance	.60	.64***	.86***				64	
A5: Modesty	.69	.52***	.82***				55	
A6: Tender-Mindedness	.49	.37***	.75***				60	
C1: Competence	.69	.34***	.80***	-47				55
C2: Order	.53	.64***	.88***					77
C3: Dutifulness	.65	.50***	.83***					66
C4: Achievement Striving	.68	.61***	.78***					78
C5: Self-Discipline	.77	.53***	.93***	-44				72
C6: Deliberation	.70	.47***	.83***	-40			44	49
Congruence Coefficient				95	93	95	95	97

Note. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness to Experience; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. Coefficient alphas and factor loadings ($\geq .40$, decimal points omitted) are from the Police Selection sample, $N = 225$. Domain scales were not included in the factor analysis. Cross-observer correlations are between a self-report (Form S) and two averaged peer ratings (Form R) in a college sample, $N = 101$, from Piedmont (1994), reproduced by permission. Cross-language correlations are between the Spanish and English Editions, $N = 74$ Hispanic bilinguals.

*** $p < .001$.

Realistic interests are poorly predicted by personality traits (Schinka et al., 1994), and some personality traits—notably those in the domains of Neuroticism and Conscientiousness—are weakly related to vocational interests. These considerations suggest that personality inventories should supplement, rather than replace, vocational interest inventories.

Traditionally, personality traits have also been distinguished from abilities. In a factor analytic sense, measures of cognitive ability (such as the Army Alpha subtests) form a separate factor alongside the five personality factors in joint analyses (McCrae & Costa, 1985). But in the area of vocational behavior, *abilities* can mean social and emotional skills that reflect dispositions as much as sheer capacities. The abilities to work under pressure, to lead a group discussion, or to get along with difficult colleagues are surely relevant to job performance, although they could not be measured by tests of verbal ability or manual dexterity. Personality traits are better predictors of such abilities (Hogan & Hogan, 1992).

Using Personality Data in Vocational Counseling

Personality data should, thus, serve as a supplement to interest and ability data in career assessment. But, how should a counselor utilize information from the NEO PI-R in vocational counseling? The most general answer is that personality scores can help both counselor and client to understand the client's strengths and weaknesses and, thus, make more appropriate and realistic occupational choices.

Scores on Extraversion, Openness, and Agreeableness can serve as checks on the interpretation of vocational interests. Open people, for example, have a wide range of interests and are likely to endorse interests in many different vocations (Costa et al., 1984). Such a person might find the prospect of being a poet, a journalist, or a tree surgeon equally attractive on first consideration. But just as good counselors would point out that there are relatively few job opportunities for poets, they should also explain that the work of a tree surgeon is unlikely to sustain the interest of an inquisitive and innovative individual. Again, an introvert who expresses an interest in the occupation of sales manager may be confused about the amount of social interaction the job entails.

Scores on Neuroticism and Conscientiousness are less relevant to preferences for particular occupations, but important nonetheless for understanding adaptation to a career. Individuals who are high in Neuroticism are prone to distress and dissatisfaction regardless of their life situation (Costa, McCrae, & Zonderman, 1987); they are likely to be unhappy in whatever job they have (Perone, DeWaard, & Baron, 1979). This is a crucial fact for counselors to understand, particularly when an individual is considering a career change. A different job is unlikely to solve problems that are rooted in the individual's basic emotional make-up. By contrast, an individual who scores low on Neuroticism but finds his or her career unrewarding is a better candidate for a successful career shift.

Neuroticism is also likely to affect job performance and suitability. An individual who is chronically nervous should probably not work on a bomb squad; a hostile and temperamental person should not normally be entrusted

with delicate diplomatic missions. Although the entire configuration of traits and abilities must be considered in judging the fit between individual and occupation; in general, individuals high in Neuroticism are probably best suited for positions that are low in stressfulness and require little emotional control. Stressful occupations, like police work, usually require at least moderately well-adjusted employees.

Conscientiousness—or the lack of it—is also relevant to the full range of occupations. Conscientious individuals are hard-working and achievement oriented, and are consistently rated as superior employees (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Piedmont & Weinstein, 1994). High scorers are probably best suited to demanding jobs that require initiative, persistence, and organization (although the career success such individuals attain may be at the expense of personal growth in other aspects of life). Low scorers on this factor are less ambitious (although they may be equally talented) and need to consider carefully their own level of motivation in choosing an occupation.

These generalizations suggest a few of the possible contributions of global trait measurement to career assessment. Further refinements are possible at the facet level. Of two individuals equally high in Conscientiousness, one might score high chiefly in Order and Dutifulness, another in Competence and Achievement Striving. These facets may predict quite different aspects of successful job performance (Schneider & Hough, in press). Indeed, all 30 facets of the NEO PI-R are potentially relevant to career choices.

A number of features have been developed to help counselors and clients use information from the NEO PI-R. In addition to the manual (Costa & McCrae, 1992a) and journal articles (e.g., Costa & McCrae, in press-a; McCrae & Costa, 1991), career counselors may find the computer-generated NEO PI-R Interpretive Report helpful. It provides a description of the client's personality at both broad factor and specific facet levels and indicates a number of possible implications in such areas as coping and adaptation, interpersonal behaviors, and needs and motives. The counselor can draw upon his or her experience to infer the vocational relevance of this information.

One of the goals of career assessment is to give clients a better understanding of themselves. Feedback about personality traits can be very useful, provided that it is phrased in informative and nonthreatening terms. A brief checklist of standing on the five factors, *Your NEO Summary*, was designed to provide that kind of information, and it has been evaluated and used in a number of different samples (Costa & McCrae, in press-b). More extensive information, including interpretations at the facet level, are available as a computer-generated Client Report from the NEO Software System.

Finally, the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), a brief version of the NEO PI-R, provides global scores for the five factors from a 60-item questionnaire. Although it lacks the richness of detail of the full, 240-item NEO PI-R, the NEO-FFI may be useful when time is limited. Details on this instrument's development and validation are included in the manual.

The Personality of Places: The NEO Job Profiler

The career counselor who wishes to explore suitable occupations for his or her client must understand not only the characteristics of the client,

but also the opportunities and requirements of a wide range of occupations. Holland's system was designed specifically to facilitate such matching by classifying persons in terms of six broad categories of vocations. No such easy and automatic translation of NEO PI-R scores into corresponding vocations is yet possible. We have, however, developed a tool for quantifying the match between a person and a specific position. At present the NEO Job Profiler is likely to be of more use to I/O psychologists than to career counselors, but with the accumulation of job profiles, it should be possible to offer a "cookbook" that lists occupations suitable for individuals with specified personality profiles. The instrument is presented here because we believe it represents an important line of new research in career assessment.

What personality characteristics are necessary or desirable for a specific job? One might ask experts to nominate traits, but different experts might suggest different traits, and the most important traits might be overlooked. Even if there were agreement on desirable traits, the problem of finding valid measures of the traits would remain. It is all very well to say that a company president should have *vision*, but how could one measure such an attribute? The NEO Job Profiler was developed to allow a comprehensive and standardized quantitative assessment of expert judgments of trait desirability for a particular occupation. The reliability of the judgments can be determined, and the desired profile can be operationalized directly by scores on the NEO PI-R.

The NEO Job Profiler is reproduced in the Appendix. The instrument consists of a set of descriptions of the 30 traits measured by the NEO PI-R in language understandable by nonpsychologists. Because of potential confusion between the normal personality factor of Neuroticism and the traditional psychiatric category of neurosis, the term *Neuroticism* is not used, and the six N facet scales are reverse scored—that is, descriptions are given for the low poles of these facets.

The NEO Job Profiler is not a scale, but a technique for determining the weights that should be applied to NEO PI-R scales in assessing the suitability of an individual for a particular position. It would normally be completed by expert judges: job analysts, supervisors, successful members of the occupation being profiled. These judges would draw upon their knowledge of job requirements to assess the relevance and desirability of each of the 30 NEO PI-R personality traits. The brief descriptions of the traits given in the instrument are intended to make it useable by judges unfamiliar with the NEO PI-R. Psychologists and counselors who are familiar with NEO PI-R constructs can draw upon that knowledge in completing the instrument. Agreement among judges¹ would provide preliminary evidence that the job profile is meaningful.

¹Because the NEO Job Profiler yields score weighting coefficients, agreement is best assessed by correlating weighted composites. Weights from one judge (or group of judges) could be applied to a sample of NEO PI-R data to calculate one composite score; weights from a second, independent judge (or group of judges) could be used to obtain a second composite score in the same sample. The correlation between these two, corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula, estimates the interjudge reliability of composite scores based on the mean of the two judges' (or groups of judges') weights. If NEO PI-R data are not available, a (generally) conservative estimate of the correlation that would be observed is provided by dividing the sum of the cross-products of the two sets of weights by the square root of the product of the sums of squares of each set of weights.

In selection settings, mean judgments on the NEO Job Profiler could be used as scoring weights, applied to candidates' NEO PI-R *T* scores to rank-order them. Applicants who scored high on NEO PI-R facets judged desirable for the job (and low on facets judged undesirable) would receive high rankings. If these rankings are to be used for selection, the composite score should be empirically validated as a predictor of job performance.

An Illustration

The NEO Job Profiler was used in conjunction with the NEO PI-R (see Table 2) in a study of police selection. Ten experts (including police personnel psychologists and supervising officers) completed the NEO Job Profiler to describe desirable characteristics of entry level police. Scored from -2 for *very undesirable* to $+2$ for *very desirable*, the mean weights for the 30 NEO PI-R facets are given in the first column of Table 3. These data show that ideal police were thought to be characterized by low scores on N2: Angry Hostility, N5: Impulsiveness, N6: Vulnerability, and A6: Tender-Mindedness, and high scores on E3: Assertiveness, C1: Competence, and C5: Self-Discipline. The interjudge reliability of the 10-judge composite was .98.

The police applicants were interviewed for 2 hours by trained psychologists, who then made a rating of recommendation. These interviewers were blind to the applicants' NEO PI-R scores and were not among the judges who completed the NEO Job Profiler. The second and third columns of Table 3 report the NEO PI-R *T* scores of 188 candidates who received Highly Recommended or Recommended ratings, and 31 candidates who received Recommended with Reservations or Not Recommended ratings (no ratings were available for 6 candidates).

Table 3 makes it clear that candidates who are recommended differ in many ways from those who are not, and most of these differences are consistent with the weights from the NEO Job Profiler. Specifically, the candidates who were recommended scored significantly lower in N2: Angry Hostility, N5: Impulsiveness, and N6: Vulnerability, and significantly higher in C1: Competence and C5: Self-Discipline. There were also a few differences. For example, expert judges believed that high Agreeableness was relatively undesirable in a police officer, whereas the candidates who received a high recommendation after a face-to-face interview were, in fact, more agreeable than those who did not. Longitudinal follow-ups that assess actual job performance would be useful in determining the relation between Agreeableness and police performance.

A catalog of NEO Job Profiler ratings for a range of occupations would be a useful tool in career assessment. The match between each job profile and a client's NEO PI-R profile would be an indication of the client's likely success in that occupation. In the meantime, the NEO Job Profiler may be useful as an aid to career planning. A client who is considering a specific career might be encouraged to complete the instrument as he or she imagines it would be completed by experts and to assess the degree to which his or her personality is compatible. Such an exercise would direct the client's attention to many aspects of the job (emotional costs, interpersonal requirements, motivational demands) that might otherwise have been overlooked.

Table 3
NEO Job Profiler Weights and NEO PI-R Mean *T* Scores
for Police Applicants

NEO PI-R facet	Job profiler weight	NEO PI-R <i>M T</i> scores	
		Recommended	Not recommended
N1: Anxiety (vs. Calmness)	1.1	43.5	48.5***
N2: Angry Hostility (vs. Even-Temperament)	-1.8	41.6	49.5***
N3: Depression (vs. Contentment)	-1.0	42.3	48.0***
N4: Self-Consciousness (vs. Poise)	-1.1	40.9	46.7***
N5: Impulsiveness (vs. Self-Control)	-1.7	42.2	49.5***
N6: Vulnerability (vs. Hardiness)	-2.0	38.3	43.5***
E1: Warmth	0.9	54.5	49.4***
E2: Gregariousness	0.3	55.9	55.6
E3: Assertiveness	1.6	58.8	56.2
E4: Activity	0.5	56.6	55.4
E5: Excitement Seeking	-1.4	54.5	59.3**
E6: Positive Emotions	0.9	54.9	51.4*
O1: Fantasy	-0.8	44.6	49.0**
O2: Aesthetics	-0.2	48.8	47.6
O3: Feelings	1.0	48.1	49.7
O4: Actions	0.0	53.0	49.2*
O5: Ideas	1.1	52.1	51.3
O6: Values	0.6	49.4	46.5*
A1: Trust	-1.3	50.8	46.7*
A2: Straightforwardness	-0.6	53.7	48.2**
A3: Altruism	0.5	58.2	52.6***
A4: Compliance	-0.1	52.9	48.1**
A5: Modesty	-0.6	48.3	46.8
A6: Tender-Mindedness	-1.5	53.1	48.4**
C1: Competence	2.0	59.9	55.5**
C2: Order	1.1	53.9	49.5**
C3: Dutifulness	0.9	57.1	51.2***
C4: Achievement Striving	0.7	61.0	56.7**
C5: Self-Discipline	2.0	59.4	52.3***
C6: Deliberation	0.2	58.8	51.5***

Note. *N* = 188 recommended, 31 not recommended.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

An Alternative: The Personality-Related Position Requirements Form

The NEO Job Profiler is offered here not as a well-validated assessment device, but rather as an example of how career assessment might proceed in characterizing the personality profiles required by various occupations. An alternative is the Personality-Related Position Requirements Form (PPRF; Schmit, Guion, & Raymark, 1994), which lists 19 job requirement dimensions grouped according to their presumed relevance to the five-factor model. For example, job analyses might suggest that a particular position requires Trustworthiness with Information (related to Conscientiousness) or Cooperative, Helping Tendencies (related to Agreeableness).

The PPRF can also be used in conjunction with the NEO PI-R, because Schmit and colleagues (1994) have provided a chart linking NEO PI-R facets to their 19 task dimensions. For example, they hypothesized that jobs requiring General Leadership will best be filled by individuals who score high on NEO PI-R E1: Warmth, E2: Gregariousness, E3: Assertiveness, E4: Activity, and O5: Ideas, and score low on A2: Straightforwardness, A3: Altruism, N1: Anxiety, N2: Angry Hostility, and N6: Vulnerability. Their chart provides a wealth of hypotheses to be tested in career assessment research.

Conclusion

Personality psychologists have always claimed that their subject matter is the person as a whole and that in consequence their work should be relevant to all aspects of psychology. In practice, applying the insights of personality psychology in specialized fields has sometimes been difficult. It is only in the past few years that personality perspectives have been welcomed again by I/O psychologists (Schneider & Hough, in press). This JCA Special Issue is testimony to renewed interest by vocational counselors and others interested in career assessment.

At least part of the reason for new optimism is progress in the field of personality assessment itself, most notably the articulation of the five-factor model. This model offers a comprehensive view of personality traits at both global and specific levels. In this article, we have described the NEO PI-R, a measure constructed to operationalize the FFM, and suggested some ways in which it may prove useful in career assessment. As a supplement to the assessment of vocational interests and specific abilities, it offers additional information on the person's emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles. That information can help both counselor and client better understand the client's strengths and weaknesses, and it can be tied directly to the opportunities and demands of different occupations through such tools as the PPRF and the NEO Job Profiler. Research using these instruments should make significant contributions to the goal of matching persons with their optimal vocational niche.

References

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Livi, S. (1994). Mapping personality dimensions in the Big Five model. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 44*, 9-15.

- Church, A. T. (1994). Relating the Tellegen and five-factor models of personality structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 898-909.
- Conn, S. R., & Rieke, M. L. (Eds.). (1994). *16PF fifth edition technical manual*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., Fozard, J. L., & McCrae, R. R. (1977). Personological interpretation of factors from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank scales. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10*, 231-243.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 258-265.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992a). *The 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., & McCrae, R. R. (1992b). Trait psychology comes of age. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 39. Psychology and Aging* (pp. 169-204). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (in press-a). Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (in press-b). The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R). In J. M. Cheek & E. M. Donahue (Eds.), *Handbook of personality inventories*. New York: Plenum.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., Bond, M. H., & Paunonen, S. V. (1994, August). *Evaluating factor replicability with targeted rotation: A Chinese example*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Dembroski, T. M. (1989). Agreeableness vs. antagonism: Explication of a potential risk factor for CHD. In A. Siegman & T. M. Dembroski (Eds.), *In search of coronary-prone behavior: Beyond Type A* (pp. 41-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 887-898.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Holland, J. L. (1984). Personality and vocational interests in an adult sample. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 390-400.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Zonderman, A. B. (1987). Environmental and dispositional influences on well-being: Longitudinal followup of an American national sample. *British Journal of Psychology, 78*, 299-306.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & Widiger, T. A. (Eds.). (1994). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Deary, I. J., & Matthews, G. (1993). Personality traits are alive and well. *The Psychologist, 6*, 299-311.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. San Diego, CA: EdITS.
- Goldberg, L. R., & Rosolack, T. K. (1994). The Big Five factor structure as an integrative framework: An empirical comparison with Eysenck's P-E-N model. In C. F. Halverson, G. A. Kohnstamm, & R. P. Martin (Eds.), *The developing structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood* (pp. 7-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gottfredson, G. D., Jones, E. M., & Holland, J. L. (1993). Personality and vocational interests: The relation of Holland's six interest dimensions to the five robust dimensions of personality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 518-524.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *Hogan Personality Inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Holland, J. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Self-Directed Search—1985 edition*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Loehlin, J. C. (1992). *Genes and environment in personality development*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCrae, R. R. (1982). Consensual validation of personality traits: Evidence from self-reports and ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*, 293-303.
- McCrae, R. R. (1988, April). *Why I advocate the five-factor model: Joint analyses of the NEO-PI with other instruments*. Paper presented at a conference on Emerging Issues in Personality Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- McCrae, R. R. (1992). The five-factor model: Issues and applications [Special issue]. *Journal of Personality*, *60*(2).
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 710-721.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, *57*, 17-40.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1991). The NEO Personality Inventory: Using the five-factor model in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *69*, 367-372.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (in press). 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*. New York: Guilford.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., & Yik, M. S. M. (in press). Universal aspects of Chinese personality structure. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- McDaniel, R. N. (1992). *The relationship between personality and perceived success of organizational change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Montag, I., & Levin, J. (1994). The five-factor personality model in applied settings. *European Journal of Personality*, *8*, 1-11.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Perone, M., DeWaard, R. J., & Baron, A. (1979). Satisfaction with real and simulated jobs in relation to personality variables and drug use. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *64*, 660-668.
- Piedmont, R. L. (1994). Validation of the NEO PI-R observer form for college students: Toward a paradigm for studying personality development. *Assessment*, *1*, 259-268.
- Piedmont, R. L., & Weinstein, H. P. (1993). A psychometric evaluation of the new NEO PI-R facet scales for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *60*, 302-318.
- Piedmont, R. L., & Weinstein, H. P. (1994). Predicting supervisor ratings of job performance using the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Psychology*, *128*, 255-265.
- Salgado, J. F., & Rumbo, A. (1994). *Personality and job performance in financial services managers*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Schinka, J. A., Haley, J. A., & Dye, D. A. (1994, August). *Concordance of five-factor and RIASEC models of personality*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Schmit, M. J., Guion, R. M., & Raymark, P. H. (1994). *Development of an instrument to identify personality-related position requirements*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Schmit, M. J., & Ryan, A. M. (1993). The Big Five in personnel selection: Factor structure in applicant and non-applicant populations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 966-974.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*, 437-453.
- Schneider, R. J., & Hough, L. M. (in press). Personality and industrial/organizational psychology. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Strong, E. K., Jr. (1951). Permanence of interest scores over 22 years. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *35*, 89-91.

Appendix

NEO Job Profiler

Name _____ Job/Title _____ Date _____

NEO Job Profiler for _____ (job or position rated)

There are 2 steps to completing this Job Profiler.

Step 1: For each of the 30 traits described below, indicate whether the trait is relevant to this particular job. Not all of the traits are expected to be relevant to all jobs. A trait is relevant to the degree that having or not having the trait will influence job performance. If the trait is relevant circle the name of the trait.

Step 2: For all traits that you considered relevant, indicate whether the trait is **Very Undesirable (VU)**, **Somewhat Undesirable (SU)**, **Somewhat Desirable (SD)**, or **Very Desirable (VD)** by circling the appropriate letters. Undesirable traits are expected to have a *negative* impact on job performance. Desirable traits are expected to have a *positive* impact on job performance.

The descriptions given below attempt to suggest both the positive and the negative aspects of each of the 30 traits; consider both the strengths and the limitations of levels of this trait. Recall also that different positions will require different characteristics in the employee, and base your ratings on the requirements of this position, **not on the desirability of the trait in general.**

Description of the trait

N1: Calmness [vs. Anxiety]

Relaxed, unconcerned, not sensitized [-2] [-1] [1] [2]
to potential problems or difficulties VU SU SD VD

[The same rating format is used for the other NEO PI-R facets:]

N2: Even-Temperament [vs. Angry Hostility]: Slow to anger or take offense, mild-tempered and easy-going

N3: Contentment [vs. Depression]: Content and imperturbable, rarely feels discouraged, not prone to guilt feelings

N4: Poise [vs. Self-Consciousness]: Confident in social groups, not easily embarrassed, insensitive to status differences

N5: Self-Control [vs. Impulsiveness]: Resists temptation, controls drives and urges; not excitable

N6: Hardiness [vs. Vulnerability]: Self-reliant, copes well with crises, can deal with stress

E1: Warmth: Friendly, talkative, eager to interact on a personal level with many others

E2: Gregariousness: Likes to be around people, sociable; finds it hard to be or work alone

E3: Assertiveness: Forceful and assertive, assumes positions of leadership, likes to be in charge

- E4: Activity:** Energetic, lively, high activity level; may find sedentary work unappealing
- E5: Excitement Seeking:** Seeks excitement, adventurous and daring, takes unnecessary risks for thrills
- E6: Positive Emotions:** Cheerful, high-spirited, buoyant in mood; laughs readily
- O1: Openness to Fantasy:** Imaginative, creative, dreamy; prone to let mind wander off into daydreams
- O2: Openness to Aesthetics:** Sensitive to art and beauty, intrigued by patterns; concerned with aesthetics
- O3: Openness to Feelings:** Emotionally sensitive, empathetic, attuned to own and others' feelings
- O4: Openness to Actions:** Adapts well to novelty, needs variety, bored by routine
- O5: Openness to Ideas:** Intellectually curious, questioning, needs stimulation of new ideas
- O6: Openness to Values:** Independent in judgment, high moral reasoning, questions authority
- A1: Trust:** Trusting, takes others at their word uncritically, can be gullible
- A2: Straightforwardness:** Frank, candid, interpersonally open; unable to manipulate others or conceal information
- A3: Altruism:** Generous, giving, courteous; not prone to put own interests first; soft-hearted
- A4: Compliance:** Gets along with others, cooperative, unwilling to raise objections or express disagreement
- A5: Modesty:** Humble, self-effacing, defers to others, unwilling to promote self
- A6: Tender-Mindedness:** Sympathetic, humanitarian; swayed by human feelings over rational judgment
- C1: Competence:** Capable, confident, well-prepared; takes pride in common sense and prudence
- C2: Order:** Well-organized, tidy, methodical; exacting and fastidious
- C3: Dutifulness:** Upright and scrupulous, a stickler for rules, can be moralistic
- C4: Achievement-Striving:** Ambitious, strives for excellence, has high standards; may be "workaholic"
- C5: Self-Discipline:** Persistent, productive, does not procrastinate, tends to push self
- C6: Deliberation:** Cautious, thoughtful, makes careful plans; may lack spontaneity

Note. Traits not considered relevant are scored 0; facets of Neuroticism are reverse scored. When the NEO Job Profiler is administered, bracketed material does not appear and items are rotated across domains (i.e., N1, E1, O1, A1, C1, N2, etc.).