Published in final edited form as:

Eur J Pers. 2008 June 1; 22(4): 291–321. doi:10.1002/per.673.

Lexical Studies of Filipino Person Descriptors: Adding Personality-Relevant Social and Physical Attributes

Shellah Myra Imperio,

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology, Washington State University

A. Timothy Church,

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology, Washington State University

Marcia S. Katigbak, and

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology, Washington State University

Jose Alberto S. Reyes

Counseling Education Department, De La Salle University—Manila

Abstract

Lexical studies have focused on traits. In the Filipino language, we investigated whether additional dimensions can be identified when personality-relevant terms for social roles, statuses, and effects, plus physical attributes, are included. Filipino students ($N = 496$) rated themselves on 268 such terms, plus 253 markers of trait and evaluative dimensions. We identified 10 dimensions of social and physical attributes—Prominence, Uselessness, Attractiveness, Respectability, Uniqueness, Destructiveness, Presentableness, Strength, Dangerousness, and Charisma. Most of these dimensions did not correspond in a one-to-one manner to Filipino or alternative trait models (Big Five, HEXACO, ML7). However, considerable redundancy was observed between the social and physical attribute dimensions and trait and evaluative dimensions. Thus, social and physical attributes communicate information about personality traits, and vice-versa.

Keywords

personality structure; indigenous; Philippines; lexical studies

The natural language provides a useful starting point for describing the nature and number of ways that people differ, an important task in the study of personality and individual differences (Goldberg, 1981; Saucier, 1997). Use of the natural language to develop comprehensive taxonomies or classifications of person-descriptive terms is based on the lexical hypothesis, which states that “those individual differences that are most salient and socially relevant in people's lives will eventually become encoded into their language” (Goldberg, 1982, p. 204). In the typical lexical study, comprehensive or representative sets of person-descriptive terms, usually trait adjectives, have been used to obtain self or peer ratings, and factor analyses have been conducted to identify the dimensions that account for the covariation among the terms. When conducted in diverse languages, lexical studies can identify cross-cultural universals in personality language, individual-differences dimensions, and person perception categories, but might also reveal how cultural differences in values and experiences influence person-descriptive categories (Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1996; John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf,

1988). In the present study, we extended previous lexical research in the Philippines (e.g., Church et al., 1996; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998; Church, Reyes, Katigbak, & Grimm, 1997) by examining additional categories of person description—in particular, terms for social roles, statuses and effects, and physical anatomy and appearance—and by relating the derived Filipino dimensions to alternative structural models in the literature. The results are important for (a) indigenous psychology, in further clarifying the structure or dimensionality of person description in a non-Western culture; and (b) cross-cultural personality psychology, by addressing the comparability of such dimensions across cultures.

Effects of Variable Selection

Very relevant for the present study is the debate among researchers about the preferred range of variable selection in lexical studies (e.g., Ashton & Lee, 2001, 2002; Goldberg, 1982; John et al., 1988; Saucier, 1997; Tellegen, 1993). The foundational lexical studies of Allport and Odbert (1936) and Norman (1967) provide a framework for understanding this debate. Allport and Odbert (1936) culled terms from a comprehensive English dictionary that could be used to “distinguish the behavior of one human being from that of another” (p. 24). Terms fitting this broad definition of personality were subsequently organized into four person-descriptive categories: (a) stable traits, which referred to generalized, consistent, and stable modes of an individual's adjustment to his environment (e.g., *aggressive*); (b) temporary states, moods, and activities (e.g., *sad, rejoicing*); (c) social evaluations (i.e., “terms conveying social and characterial judgments of personal conduct, or designated influence on others;” e.g., *irritating, worthy*); and (d) miscellaneous terms, which included “metaphorical and doubtful terms,” but also capacities, talents, and physical qualities. Allport and Odbert (1936) viewed terms for temporary states to be less personality-relevant than stable traits because they do not refer to enduring modes of adjustment. Social evaluations, which refer to the “social stimulus value” or effect one has on others, were also considered less relevant than stable traits. Although social evaluations (e.g., *desirable, irritating*) may presuppose some underlying traits of the person, the particular trait involved may not be definitive (John et al., 1988).

Norman's (1967) taxonomy, which extended the work of Allport and Odbert (1936), was also highly influential in subsequent lexical work. One important change was Norman's inclusion of terms for abilities and talents in the stable trait category, rather than a miscellaneous category. This led to the inclusion of ability terms in many subsequent lexical studies, where they helped define the Big Five Intellect dimension (e.g., Church et al., 1997; Ostendorf, 1990; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996). Like Allport and Odbert (1936), however, Norman classified purely evaluative terms (e.g., *desirable*), as well as physical terms (e.g., *good-looking, healthy*), into a broad exclusion category, judging that they were less personality-relevant. John et al. (1988) have argued, however, that Norman's categories are consistent with a broader conception of personality. They note, for example, how an individual's personality can be described in terms of a stable trait (e.g., *irascible*), by the internal states associated with that trait (e.g., *furios*), by the individual's frequent activities (e.g., *yelling*), by the social effects the individual would have on others (e.g., *frightening*), and by a general evaluation (e.g., *terrible*). That is, although terms for temporary states and activities, social effects, and general evaluations may not be traits *per se*—that is, relatively stable patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors—they are causally linked to traits and may provide useful information about personality.

Subsequent lexical researchers have consistently included stable trait terms in their studies, but have differed in their treatment of terms in other person-descriptive categories. When trait terms alone have been examined, many researchers have identified five dimensions, typically referred to as the Big Five (e.g., Angleitner & Ostendorf, 1989; De Raad, 1992; Goldberg, 1990; Hřebíčková, Ostendorf, & Angleitner, 1995; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996). These five

dimensions are usually labeled Extraversion or Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (versus Neuroticism), and Intellect (or Openness to Experience). As an alternative to the Big Five model for stable traits, Ashton and Lee (2001, 2007) advocated a six-dimensional model, noting that a sixth Honesty-Humility factor can be identified in many languages (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, et al., 2004; Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004). Apart from the additional Honesty-Humility dimension, Ashton and Lee's six-dimensional HEXACO model, comprised of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness dimensions, differs from the Big Five model in two other ways. Specifically, HEXACO Agreeableness and Emotionality do not directly correspond with their Big Five counterparts. Rather, HEXACO Agreeableness emphasizes being patient versus quick tempered, whereas Big Five Agreeableness is broader and includes attributes such as trust, altruism, kindness, affection, and other pro-social behaviors. HEXACO Emotionality emphasizes fearfulness and sensitivity, whereas Big Five Emotional Stability also includes attributes such as emotional instability, anxiety, moodiness, irritability, and sadness. Ashton, Lee, and colleagues (e.g., Ashton, Lee, Marcus, & deVries, 2007) have noted that terms referring to altruism (e.g., *good-hearted*, *helpful*, *considerate*, *altruistic*) tend to blend with either the Honesty-Humility or Agreeableness dimension, depending on the variable set, rating source, or sample.

Other researchers have advocated less restrictive sampling of person-descriptive terms in lexical studies, consistent with a broader conception of personality. For example, a number of researchers have advocated inclusion of terms for temporary states and social evaluations (Almagor, Tellegen, & Waller, 1995; Benet-Martínez & Waller, 1997, 2002; Tellegen, 1993). Temporary state terms do not appear to define distinct dimensions beyond the Big Five. Rather, they are well-encompassed by the Big Five dimensions, particularly Extraversion (for positive states) and Emotional Stability (for negative states) (Almagor et al., 1995; Benet-Martínez & Waller, 1997; Saucier, 1997; Tellegen, 1993). However, when pure evaluation terms have been included, distinct positive and negative evaluation dimensions, labeled Positive and Negative Valence, have been reported in studies of the English, Hebrew, and Spanish languages (Almagor et al., 1995; Benet-Martínez & Waller, 1997; Tellegen, 1993). Proponents have argued that Positive and Negative Valence reflect important components of self-evaluation that refer to self-perceptions of status and prominence (Positive Valence) and virtue versus social deviance (Negative Valence) (Benet-Martínez & Waller, 2002; Saucier, 2002; Tellegen, 1993). Saucier (1997) has observed, however, that when sufficient numbers of Intellect or Attractiveness terms are also included in lexical studies, Positive Valence terms tend to blend with these terms rather than defining a distinct dimension.

Debate continues about whether these evaluative dimensions have unique substantive meaning and should be included in lexical studies (Ashton & Lee, 2002; Benet-Martínez & Waller, 2002; Church et al., 1998; McCrae & Costa, 1995; Saucier, 1997, 2002; Saucier & Goldberg, 1998). In any case, the Negative Valence dimension does appear to be replicable across languages when evaluation terms are included (Almagor et al., 1995; Benet & Waller, 1995; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998; Goldberg & Somer, 2000; Saucier, 1997). Indeed, after observing impressive convergence between the seven dimensions identified in the Filipino and Hebrew studies, Saucier (2003) proposed the Multi-Language Seven (ML7) model, which is comprised of Gregariousness, Self-Assurance, Even Temper (vs. Temperamentalness), Concern for Others, Conscientiousness, Intellect (or Originality/ Virtuosity), and Negative Valence (or Social Unacceptability) dimensions. Saucier (2003) showed that the ML7 dimensions can also be recovered in the English language when a broader sampling of person-descriptive terms is analyzed, including not only stable trait terms, but also terms for states and social evaluations.

Saucier (1997) conducted the most thorough examination of the effects of including additional categories of person description in a study of the English lexicon. He showed that a stable Big Five structure emerges when trait terms, or a combination of trait and state terms, are analyzed. When terms for social roles and effects, evaluations, and physical appearance were added, two additional factors were identified: Attractiveness and Negative Valence. The Attractiveness factor was defined by terms that refer to physical attractiveness and related social evaluations (e.g., *glamorous*, *charming*, *graceful*, and *seductive*). However, except for stable trait terms, Saucier did not report the dimensionality of the different person-descriptive categories separately. In a similar study, Goldberg and Somer (2000) also identified Big Five variants plus Negative Valence and Attractiveness dimensions when they analyzed familiar Turkish person descriptors that included terms for evaluation and physical attributes. These studies indicate that additional dimensions can be identified when researchers sample person-descriptive categories beyond stable traits.

Why Study Terms for Social and Physical Attributes

As the above review makes clear, lexical researchers differ in the categories of person description they consider personality-relevant. Researchers who focus exclusively on stable traits treat personality as residing “within” the individual (i.e., internal attributes), whereas a broader conception might also incorporate more external attributes such as the roles individuals’ play, their status in society, the effect they have on others, and their physical appearance, at least to the extent that these attributes are deemed by cultural informants to provide information about personality (Goldberg, 1982; John et al., 1988; Saucier, 1997; Saucier & Simonds, 2006). For brevity, we will refer to terms in these categories as social and physical attributes. Many of the terms in these additional categories may not refer to personality traits *per se*, but may be causally associated with traits or provide useful information about personality. For example, John et al. (1988) and Angleitner, Ostendorf, and John (1990) argued that social roles and statuses reveal the impact that traits have on other people. If one prefers, the inclusion of such terms can be viewed as leading to a more comprehensive structure of *person perception* (Saucier, 1997) or *person description*, rather than personality traits *per se*.

Goldberg (1982) argued that a complete language of personality description should ultimately include terms for social roles and relationships. Indeed, he provided a preliminary set of conceptual categories for common English terms that refer to social roles, relationships, or effects, which included categories such as Fame, Respect, Charm, Attraction, Entertainment-Value, and Influence. Indeed, cultural psychologists have argued that social roles, statuses, and effects may be especially important categories of person description in collectivistic or group-centered cultures, in which individuals’ social roles and relationships may be more central to identity than traits and more predictive of behavior (Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Similarly, noting the important links between personality, health, and appearance, John et al. (1988) argued for inclusion of physical attribute terms in an “exhaustive specification of personality” (p. 186). For example, meta-analyses of studies that have investigated physical attractiveness stereotypes indicate that self and other perceptions of physical attractiveness are positively associated with assessments of social and intellectual competence, sociability, dominance, self-esteem, general mental health, and freedom from social anxiety (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991; Feingold, 1992). Self-perceived physical appearance has also been related to subjective well-being (Diener, Wolsic, & Fujita, 1995), and a negative body image is predictive of eating disorders (Mintz & Betz, 1988). Again, while physical attributes may not be personality traits, they may relate to, or provide information about, personality.

In summary, there is evidence from several languages about the impact of temporary state and evaluative terms on the structure or dimensions of person description. However, very few lexical researchers have incorporated social and physical attribute terms in their studies, nor have they examined the structure of these categories separately (Saucier, 1997; Goldberg & Somer, 2000). As Saucier (1997) has argued:

With no clear consensus as to which attributes ought to be counted as personality variables, the most informative procedure would be to sample broadly from attributes of diverse types and carry out a reliable classification of the descriptors into variable categories, thus enabling some control for the effects of variable selection (p. 1297)

Filipino Lexical Studies

Filipino, the national language of the Philippines, is a member of the Austronesian language family and based largely on the Tagalog language. Church et al. (1996) culled terms from a comprehensive Filipino dictionary and identified 6,900 person-descriptive adjectives. These were classified with good reliability into subcategories of Angleitner et al.'s (1990) major person-descriptive categories (i.e., personality and ability traits, temporary states, social roles and relationships, and overt characteristics), which closely resemble the Norman (1967) categories. To date, the Filipino lexical team has reported studies of stable traits (Church et al., 1996, 1997; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998) and temporary states (Church, Katigbak, Reyes, & Jensen, 1998, 1999).

When Filipino trait adjectives have been investigated, seven dimensions have replicated well: Concern for Others versus Egotism, Gregariousness, Self-Assurance, Temperamentality, Intellect, Conscientiousness, and Negative Valence. The Negative Valence dimension emerged even when terms originally judged to be pure evaluations were excluded. When positive evaluative terms have been included, they have blended with Intellect terms to define an Intellect/Positive Valence dimension. In some factor solutions, Egotism terms from the Concern for Others dimension and Religiosity terms, which tend to load on both the Conscientiousness and Concern for Others dimensions, have split off to form separate factors (Church et al., 1997; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998).

In general, good one-to-one empirical correspondences have been found between Philippine Concern for Others and Big Five Agreeableness, Philippine Conscientiousness and Big Five Conscientiousness, Philippine Gregariousness and Big Five Extraversion, and Philippine Intellect and Big Five Intellect. The Philippine Temperamentality and Self-Assurance dimensions, although typically most related to Big Five Emotional Stability, have tended to be multidimensional in terms of the Big Five. Not surprisingly, given that Saucier's (2003) ML7 model was derived, in part, from the Filipino lexical studies, Church and Katigbak (2005) found good one-to-one correspondence between ML7 marker scales and the seven Philippine lexical dimensions. Ashton and Lee (2007) interpret the Filipino Concern for Others versus Egotism factor as a broad Honesty-Humility dimension, encompassing both honesty-humility and altruism terms. However, we prefer the Concern for Others label, at least as an indigenous name, because it better captures the full scope of the dimension, which has never yet emerged in Philippine samples as a narrower Honesty-Humility factor without the blended altruism terms.

Church, Katigbak, Reyes, and Jensen (1998, 1999) investigated Filipino (Tagalog) terms for emotions or affects. Using cluster analyses of the semantic similarity judgments of Filipino informants, Church, Katigbak, Reyes, and Jensen (1998) identified emotion categories that resembled basic emotion categories identified in Western studies (e.g., happy, aroused, contented, angry, sad, guilty, anxious). In subsequent studies of the self-report structure of affect or emotion, Church et al. (1999) found that the Filipino structure of affect was quite

similar to the hierarchical structure of affect found in Western studies (e.g., Russell, 1991; Watson & Tellegen, 1985). In summary, previous lexical studies of the Filipino language have investigated the structure of terms for stable traits (including abilities), temporary states, and pure evaluations, but not the remaining substantive categories in the Allport and Odbert (1936), Norman (1967), and Angleitner et al. (1990) classifications, which include terms for social roles, statuses, and effects, and physical anatomy and appearance (i.e., social and physical attributes).¹

Overview of the Study

In the present study, we had several goals. First, we wished to investigate the structure or dimensionality of Filipino adjectives that refer to social and physical attributes. We limited our examination of these categories to those terms judged by cultural informants to have fairly direct relevance or implications for personality. Second, we wished to determine whether any new dimensions would emerge in these person-descriptive categories, beyond those obtained with trait and evaluative terms. Third, we sought to investigate how indigenous dimensions of social and physical attributes relate to dimensions in the Big Five, HEXACO, and ML7 models. In relating the Filipino dimensions of social and physical attributes to personality models based on trait adjectives, we are not implying that social and physical attributes should be viewed as referring to traits per se, or that existing models of personality trait structure should be expanded to include social and physical attributes. However, like many lexical researchers (Goldberg, 1982; John et al., 1988; Saucier, 1997), we believe that more complete taxonomies of person description will be obtained by including these additional categories. Because lexical researchers have not yet derived structural models for social and physical attributes, existing trait models currently provide the only basis for determining whether social and physical attributes add anything new in the broader domain of person description.

Method

Sample

Participants were 496 Filipino college students (186 men, 310 women) enrolled in a state university in Batangas province (Batangas State University, $n = 145$) and two private universities in Manila (De La Salle University, $n = 122$; University of Santo Tomas, $n = 229$). Mean age was 18.03 ($SD = 1.36$). Participants of all year levels and a variety of college majors were sampled. In questions about language background, 92% described themselves as native speakers of Filipino (Tagalog), 92% cited Tagalog as their best language, and all of the students rated their ability to understand a Tagalog questionnaire as at least fair (poor, 0%; fair, 39%; good, 50%; very good, 11%).

Instruments

A 521-item self-rating form was administered. It contained, in random order, 268 Filipino adjectives that refer to personality-relevant social and physical attributes, and 253 adjectives that were used as markers of the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions and the Big Five,

¹Less clearly represented in previous Filipino lexical studies are terms associated with the sexual dimensions deemed relevant by Schmitt and Buss (2000) from an evolutionary psychology perspective. Of the seven sexual dimensions identified by Schmitt and Buss, only three have some representation in our Filipino lexical studies. These include Sexual Attractiveness (e.g., *attractive*), a physical attribute dimension, Emotional Investment (e.g., *loving*, *affectionate*, *compassionate*), which are aspects of the Filipino trait dimension labeled Concerned for Others, and perhaps Erotophilic disposition (e.g., *shameless*), an aspect of Filipino Negative Valence. In addition, in an early study of Filipino trait terms (Church et al., 1997, Study 1) we identified a small (11 terms) Seductiveness factor in a follow-up factor analysis of terms with low loadings on the primary dimensions. However, we eliminated this factor from further consideration because most of the terms were lewd and gender-specific. Although the terms investigated by Schmitt and Buss are consistent with their evolutionary perspective, many of them might not be appropriate for assessment purposes in some cultural contexts (e.g., *sexy*, *erotic*, *adulterous*, *horny*, *lustful*, *homosexual*, *orgasmic*, *marriageable*).

HEXACO, and ML7 dimensions. Participants rated the extent to which each adjective accurately described themselves using an 8-point scale that ranged from extremely inaccurate to extremely accurate. Participants wrote an 'X' in lieu of a rating when they did not know a term.

Social and physical attributes—The 268 social and physical attribute terms were obtained from the comprehensive dictionary-based list of 6,900 person-descriptive adjectives derived by Church et al. (1996). Of that list, 3,478 terms had been classified by at least six of nine Filipino judges as referring to social roles, statuses, and effects (3,037 terms), or to physical abilities, anatomy, and appearance (441 terms). Although the Filipino language includes a large number of terms in these categories, most have little or no relevance for personality. Therefore, eleven Filipino-English bilinguals, all college graduates in the Philippines, judged which of the 3,478 terms had direct relevance or implications for personality. The following instruction was provided to the judges: "Circle the term, if, in its common usage, it has fairly clear and direct implications for (i.e., clearly tells us something about) a person's personality, character, or ability." We wished to rely on the judges' culture-relevant or indigenous conceptions of personality, character, and ability, so we did not provide definitions of these concepts. For the terms themselves, judges were encouraged to refer to the dictionary definitions provided with each term, if necessary, but to rely more on their own personal knowledge of the term, because some dictionary definitions do not reflect current usage. As an index of agreement, coefficient α was computed, treating each judge as an item ($\alpha = .81$). A total of 339 terms were judged to be personality-relevant by at least four judges. Examples of terms judged to be personality-relevant are shown in Table 1.² These were further reduced to 268 by eliminating the following: (a) some redundant terms with the same root and meaning (e.g., *buwisit* [one who annoys others] was deleted, whereas *nakakabuwisit* [annoying] was retained); (b) some gender-specific terms (e.g., *disgrasyada* [bore a child out of wedlock]); and (c) a few ambiguous terms.

Filipino trait and evaluative scales—Marker scales measuring the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions identified in previous lexical studies have been constructed previously from the 253 trait and evaluative adjectives included in the self-rating form (Church et al., 1997; Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998; Katigbak, Church, Guanzon-Lapeña, Carlota, & del Pilar, 2002). The number of terms and the alpha reliabilities for each scale in the present sample were as follows: Self-Assurance, 47 items, $\alpha = .90$; Gregariousness, 37 items, $\alpha = .91$; Concern for Others versus Egotism, 43 items, $\alpha = .89$; Temperamentalness, 28 items, $\alpha = .90$; Conscientiousness, 29 items, $\alpha = .89$; Intellect, 15 items, $\alpha = .78$; Religiosity, 7 items, $\alpha = .88$; Positive Valence, 10 items, $\alpha = .76$; and Negative Valence, 13 items, $\alpha = .74$. The Filipino terms scored for the various marker scales, and their English translations, are available from the authors. Pearson correlations among the nine trait and evaluative scales ranged from $-.52$ to $.51$, with seven correlations exceeding $.40$ in absolute value ($p < .01$): Concern for Others with Conscientiousness ($r = .51$), Temperamentalness ($r = -.52$), and Religiosity ($r = .44$); Conscientiousness with Temperamentalness ($r = -.48$) and Gregariousness ($r = -.46$); and Self-Assurance with Temperamentalness ($r = -.50$).

²Examples of excluded terms—that is, terms judged to have no direct or clear implications for personality—are the following: *alat* (unlucky), *anak-pawis* (born poor), *armado* (armed, having weapons), *bahete* (broke, bankrupt), *balingkot* (partially deaf), *balbon* (thick-bearded, very hairy), *dayuhan* (alien, foreign to a place), *despigurado* (disfigured, deformed), *di-kasal* (unmarried), *ekspulsado* (expelled, dismissed), *emansipado* (emancipated), *gabaka* (as big as a cow), *ginahis* (overpowered, raped), *hawas* (slender, well-proportioned), *hubot-hubad* (naked), *itim* (dark, black), *kasalin* (engaged to be married), *kulot* (curly haired), *maanak* (having many relatives), *mabigat* (heavy), *mag-isa* (alone, without companion), *maliit* (small), *masagana* (wealthy), *mataba* (fat), *mautang* (having many debts or obligations), *may-asawa* (married), *may-hanapbuhay* (employed), *mestiso* (mixed ethnicity), *nakabukod* (living separately), *nakabihis* (dressed up), *nawala* (lost, missing), *panot* (bald), *patiwalalan* (a person assigned to hold things in trust), *payat* (thin), *pilay* (lame), *piyapis* (defeated), *pugante* (fugitive), *sakop* (under someone's jurisdiction or power), *sasamahan* (someone you will accompany), *sumasali* (someone who participates in games), *sumasayawa* (dancer), *tagapagtago* (person given the duty to safekeep things), *tinalo* (an opponent who was defeated), *walang-bayan* (without a country), *walang-gutom* (free from hunger), *walang-kasama* (alone), *walang-panganib* (out of danger), *yayat* (emaciated).

Big Five marker scales—Terms in a master list of Filipino trait adjectives were previously classified by nine Filipino-English bilinguals into the Big Five domains using Goldberg's (1990) 133-category taxonomy (Church et al., 1996). The category judgments were made with good reliability (median $\alpha = .89$). Markers of each Big Five dimension that were among the 253 trait and evaluative adjectives in the present self-rating form comprised the Big Five marker scales. The number of terms and the alpha reliabilities for the scales were as follows: Extraversion, 46 items, $\alpha = .86$; Agreeableness, 81 items, $\alpha = .92$; Conscientiousness, 47 items, $\alpha = .88$; Emotional Stability, 12 items, $\alpha = .72$; and Intellect, 29 items, $\alpha = .70$. Pearson correlations among the five marker scales ranged from $-.06$ to $.64$, with two correlations exceeding $.40$ ($p < .01$): Agreeableness with Conscientiousness ($r = .64$) and Conscientiousness with Emotional Stability ($r = .47$).

HEXACO marker scales—Also included in the self-rating form were Filipino markers of Ashton and Lee's (2001) HEXACO dimensions. In the list of 253 trait adjectives, we identified Filipino adjectives that are close translations of English adjective markers of the HEXACO dimensions. Our initial list was reviewed by Michael Ashton and Kibeom Lee. Based on their recommendations, we revised the list slightly, resulting in a final set of Filipino adjective markers of the HEXACO dimensions. The number of terms and the alpha reliabilities for the six marker scales were as follows: Honesty-Humility, 17 items, $\alpha = .72$; Emotionality, 16 items, $\alpha = .82$; Extraversion, 19 items, $\alpha = .81$; Agreeableness, 19 items, $\alpha = .76$; Conscientiousness, 17 items, $\alpha = .82$; and Openness to Experience, 13 items, $\alpha = .68$. Pearson correlations among the six marker scales ranged from $-.42$ to $.58$, with four correlations exceeding $.40$ in absolute value ($p < .01$): Honesty-Humility with Agreeableness ($r = .57$) and Conscientiousness ($r = .58$); Agreeableness with Conscientiousness ($r = .53$); and Conscientiousness with Emotionality ($r = -.42$).

Multi-Language 7 (ML7) marker scales—Saucier (2003) developed a 60-item English language measure of the ML7 dimensions using 40 English translations of terms in the Filipino and Hebrew factor structures that served as the basis for the ML7 model, plus 20 supplemental English markers of the dimensions. We identified good Filipino translations in the Filipino self-rating form for 38 of the 60 ML7 markers. The number of terms and alpha reliabilities for the ML7 marker scales were as follows: Even-Temper, 7 items, $\alpha = .81$; Conscientiousness, 5 items, $\alpha = .52$; Gregariousness, 7 items, $\alpha = .73$; Concern for Others, 5 items, $\alpha = .60$; Self-Assurance, 9 items, $\alpha = .73$; Intellect, 2 items, $\alpha = .56$; and Negative Valence, 3 items, $\alpha = .35$. The reliabilities for some of the ML7 marker scales were marginal and could result in some attenuated correlations, but did not prevent the scales from exhibiting sensible convergent correlations with the Filipino scales in the results.³ Pearson correlations among the seven marker scales ranged from $-.31$ (Gregariousness vs. Conscientiousness) to $.38$ (Even Temper vs. Self-Assurance) ($p < .01$).

Procedure

Members of the research team administered the self-rating form to student volunteers in regular classes. Classes with longer meeting times were sampled to allow sufficient time (1½ - 2 hours) for completion.

³Many of the dimensions in the alternative trait models (i.e., the Filipino trait dimensions, Big Five, HEXACO, and ML7) are defined by the same terms in lexical studies. Therefore, there was naturally some overlap between the terms comprising essentially the same dimension (e.g., Conscientiousness) in the alternative models. From our set of 253 trait and evaluative adjectives in the self-rating form, we included all relevant markers for the dimensions in each model to maximize their content breadth and representativeness, and their internal consistency reliability. There was, of course, no overlap between the social and physical attribute terms and the terms defining the trait and evaluative dimensions.

Results

Filipino Dimensions of Social and Physical Attributes

Lexical researchers differ in their preferences regarding the use of ipsatized versus raw data (e.g., Goldberg & Somer, 2000; Saucier, 2003). In ipsatized data, participants' scores for each item are first standardized using their own mean and standard deviation across all items. The goal is to control for individual differences in scale use (i.e., response styles). In the present study, we examined factor solutions for the social and physical attributes using both raw and ipsatized data and found cleaner, more differentiated solutions with the ipsatized data (see below). Another reason for focusing on the ipsatized data was that the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions had been derived previously using ipsatized data. We believed it was preferable to use the same type of data (i.e., ipsatized) for both sets of dimensions in these comparisons.

In preliminary analyses, 44 social and physical attribute terms were eliminated because 35% or more of the students were unfamiliar with them. This left 224 social and physical attribute terms and 253 trait and evaluative terms, or 477 terms overall. We first analyzed the social and physical attribute terms alone, using principal components analyses with varimax rotations. With the ipsatized data, the first ten eigenvalues were 16.58, 10.07, 7.80, 4.77, 4.35, 4.06, 3.58, 3.43, 3.02, and 2.85. Thus, the pattern of eigenvalues was not definitive regarding the number of meaningful factors. A primary objective of the study was to determine whether additional dimensions, distinct from known trait dimensions, could be identified in social and physical attribute terms. The opportunity to identify distinct dimensions would be maximized by selecting the most differentiated solution with interpretable factors. In the ipsatized data, this was the 9-factor solution, which accounted for 25.9% of the variance. This relatively low percentage of explained variance is typical of lexical studies in which data have been ipsatized (e.g., Caprara & Perugini, 1994; DeRaad, Hendriks, & Hofstee, 1992; Szirmak & DeRaad, 1994). Table 1 lists the terms with the largest factor loadings, both positive and negative, in the rotated component matrix.

We labeled the first factor Prominence. The terms with high loadings refer to being famous, popular, well-known, powerful, and influential. We labeled the second factor Uselessness. High loading terms refer to being without education, friends, or ambition, and being useless and incapable. The third factor, which we labeled Attractiveness, was defined by terms that refer to being charming, attractive, desirable, and beautiful. We labeled the fourth factor Respectability. High loading terms refer to being respectable, a model individual, successful, and honorable. The fifth factor, labeled Uniqueness, was defined by terms that refer to being incomparable, matchless, and distinctive rather than common. The sixth factor, labeled Destructiveness versus Presentableness, was a blend of terms that refer to being destructive and detestable versus clean and presentable. The seventh factor, labeled Strength, was defined by terms that refer to being swift, strong, and assertive, as opposed to weak and lacking in confidence. We labeled the eighth factor Dangerousness. High loading terms refer to someone who provokes others and is a source of danger, fear, or annoyance. We labeled the ninth factor Charisma. It was defined by terms that refer to being interesting, entertaining, and causing joy or happiness.⁴

⁴In the principal components analysis of the raw data, the factors were less differentiated, as indicated by the pattern of eigenvalues and the content and size of the dimensions (the first ten eigenvalues were 26.75, 21.89, 6.05, 4.78, 4.10, 3.70, 3.25, 2.94, 2.76). For example, in the 10-component solution, some of the dimensions identified in the ipsatized data (i.e., Uselessness, Attractiveness, and Uniqueness) also emerged as distinct dimensions in the raw data. However, some factors in the raw data were blends of distinct dimensions identified in the ipsatized data (i.e., Prominence blended with Strength, Respectability with Charisma, and Dangerousness with Destructiveness). In addition, factors 7, 8, 9, and 10 were defined by less than 6 items each. In the 9-component solution in the raw data, the varimax-rotated solution did not converge in a reasonable number of iterations.

As noted above, we selected the 9-factor solution in the ipsatized data to maximize the number of interpretable dimensions or distinctions for comparisons with the various trait models. Solutions of one to eight factors were also examined, however, and revealed how the nine dimensions blend or merge at higher levels in a hierarchy. For example, the 4-factor solution was interpretable, but too broad. It was comprised of two evaluative dimensions, Uselessness and Uniqueness, while the remaining dimensions from the 9-factor solution blended into two broad factors that might be labeled Agency or Dynamism (largely a blend of Prominence, Attractiveness, Charisma, and Strength) and Socialization or Propriety (largely a blend of Respectability vs. Dangerousness and Destructiveness). At a more refined level, the 7-factor solution, which was comprised of distinct Respectability (vs. Dangerousness), Prominence, Uselessness, Attractiveness (including Charisma), Uniqueness, Strength, and Presentableness versus Destructiveness dimensions, was a viable alternative to the 9-factor solution. However, to obtain distinct Charisma and Dangerousness factors we needed to extract 8 and 9 factors, respectively.

Relation of Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions to Filipino Trait and Evaluative Dimensions

Do these dimensions of social and physical attributes contribute anything beyond the previously identified Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions? To answer this question, we conducted two analyses. First, we jointly factored the markers of the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions and the 224 terms for social and physical attributes in a single principal components analysis. The purpose was to determine whether additional dimensions would be identified, or whether social and physical attribute terms are adequately subsumed by the trait and evaluative dimensions (e.g., see Saucier, 1997). Second, we conducted a series of regression and canonical analyses to quantify the extent of overlap or redundancy between the social and physical attribute dimensions, on the one hand, and the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions and the alternative trait models (Big Five, HEXACO, and ML7), on the other hand.

Joint principal components analysis—In the joint principal components analysis of the Filipino social and physical attribute terms with the Filipino trait and evaluative terms, we examined solutions of 6 to 12 rotated components. This would provide ample opportunity for new or unique dimensions of social and physical attributes to emerge beyond the usual number of Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions. The scree plot indicated that at least six, and perhaps as many as eight or nine, components were needed (the first ten eigenvalues were 36.69, 23.41, 15.72, 12.50, 8.87, 7.93, 6.32, 6.06, 5.57, and 4.79). The eight-component solution was the most interpretable and accounted for 24.7% of the variance. The seven-component solution resulted in a blending of distinct Filipino trait dimensions and the 9- to 12-component solutions did not produce any dimensions defined uniquely by social and physical attribute terms. Table 2 shows the terms with the largest positive and negative factor loadings for the joint solution. In brackets after each term is an abbreviation of the trait, evaluative, or social and physical attribute dimension from which the term derives. Because only the highest loading terms are shown in Table 2, we sometimes note in the text additional terms that loaded on a given component.

We labeled the first joint component Conscientiousness. It was defined primarily by terms from the trait Conscientiousness and Religiosity dimensions (e.g., having faith in God, prayerful, godly, and spiritual) and the social and physical attribute dimension labeled Respectability (e.g., respectable, honorable). The second joint component, which we labeled Self-Assurance, was primarily comprised of markers from the trait Self-Assurance dimension (e.g., strong-willed, active, brave) and the social and physical attribute dimension Strength (e.g., swift, strong vs. easily scared, without strength). We labeled the third joint component Appeal. This dimension was largely a blend of the social and physical attribute dimensions of

Prominence and Attractiveness. Positive Valence terms that refer to superlative qualities (i.e., superb, admirable, commendable) and four terms from the trait Intellect dimension (e.g., smart, intelligent) also loaded on this component.

We labeled the fourth joint component Uselessness. The positive pole was defined primarily by terms from the social and physical attribute Uselessness dimension and the evaluative Negative Valence dimension (e.g., stupid, uneducated, troublemaker). The negative pole was defined by terms from the trait Temperamentalness dimension and the social and physical attribute Destructiveness dimension. We labeled the fifth joint component Concern for Others versus Egotism. Most of the high loading terms were from the trait Concern for Others versus Egotism dimension, with the social and physical attribute Dangerousness dimension also defining the negative pole. The sixth joint component, which we labeled Gregariousness, was primarily defined by terms from the trait Gregariousness dimension and the social and physical attribute Charisma dimension. We labeled the seventh joint component Uniqueness. It was primarily a blend of the social and physical attribute Uniqueness dimension and Positive Valence items that refer to distinctiveness (e.g., unique, distinctive, special). The eighth joint component was small and less definitive. It might be labeled Culture, Intellect, or Openness. It combined terms from the trait Intellect dimension with some terms from the trait Concern for Others dimension that refer to having a conscience and being caring and generous to others.

To summarize, terms from many of the social and physical attribute dimensions, including Respectability, Strength, Uselessness, Dangerousness, and Charisma, combined with terms from the trait dimensions to define joint components rather than distinct social and physical attribute dimensions. Three other social and physical attribute dimensions—Prominence, Attractiveness, and Uniqueness—were relatively distinct from the trait dimensions, but did overlap in varying degrees with the Positive Valence evaluative terms. This was especially the case for Uniqueness. In the joint component analysis, the best candidate for a new or distinct dimension, comprised predominantly, but not entirely, of social and physical attribute terms, was the Appeal component, which was largely a blend of the Prominence and Attractiveness social and physical attribute dimensions.

Regression analyses—For subsequent analyses, we constructed scales to measure the social and physical attributes dimensions. All terms that loaded .30 or higher in absolute value on a given component were included in the relevant scale. Items with dual loadings were allocated to the dimension (scale) with the highest loading. Although a nine-component solution was reported in Table 1, we constructed separate scales to measure Presentableness and Destructiveness because they seemed conceptually distinct (and emerged as separate dimensions in a 12-component solution). The number of items and alpha reliability values for the ten scales were as follows: Prominence, 24 items, $\alpha = .87$; Uselessness, 24 items, $\alpha = .85$; Attractiveness, 12 items, $\alpha = .86$; Respectability, 19 items, $\alpha = .73$; Uniqueness, 12 items, $\alpha = .82$; Presentableness, 7 items, $\alpha = .64$; Destructiveness, 9 items, $\alpha = .65$; Strength, 16 items, $\alpha = .71$; Dangerousness, 9 items, $\alpha = .69$; and Charisma, 6 items, $\alpha = .77$. The intercorrelations among the scales were generally modest (mean $|r| = .16$) and only two pairs of scales correlated more than .40 in absolute value (Prominence vs. Attractiveness, $r = .44$; Respectability vs. Dangerousness, $r = -.42$).

The relevant bivariate and adjusted multiple correlations are shown in Table 3. The left-most column labeled *Adj R* shows the adjusted multiple correlations derived by regressing each social and physical attribute scale onto all of the trait scales simultaneously. The far-right column shows the *Adj R* values obtained when each social and physical attribute dimension was regressed on all of the trait and evaluative dimensions simultaneously. Inversely, the *Adj R* values in the bottom row of the table were obtained by regressing each trait or evaluative dimension onto all of the social and physical attribute dimensions simultaneously. These

regression results, and the joint component analysis reported in the previous section, led to similar conclusions.⁵

In Table 3, strong convergence was again seen between (a) Strength and trait Self-Assurance; (b) Dangerousness and trait Concern for Others (inversely); (c) Respectability and trait Conscientiousness, with a secondary relationship with trait Concern for Others; (d) Uniqueness and Positive Valence; and (e) Uselessness and Negative Valence with trait Temperamentality (inversely). The Charisma scale was only moderately related to trait Gregariousness, probably because the former scale is narrower in content. The Destructiveness scale was again most associated with Negative Valence. The small Presentableness scale (e.g., presentable, tidy vs. dirty) did not converge much with any of the trait or evaluative scales, and thus may cover unique content. Neither the Attractiveness nor Prominence scales from the Appeal component in the joint component analysis showed strong convergence with a particular trait or evaluative scale. Rather, Attractiveness was moderately related to both Positive Valence and Intellect, and Prominence was moderately related to several trait and evaluative scales. Finally, a comparison of the *Adj R* values reveals a noteworthy finding: The trait and evaluative dimensions were predicted as well or better by the social and physical attribute dimensions as vice-versa. We revisit this finding when we report the results of our canonical analyses below.

Relation of Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions to the Alternative Trait Models

Regression analyses—Are the Filipino social and physical attribute dimensions well subsumed by one or more of the alternative trait models or do they add something new? In Tables 4, 5, and 6 we show the Pearson correlations relating the social and physical attribute scales to the marker scales for the Big Five, HEXACO, and ML7 models, respectively. Also shown are the adjusted multiple correlations (*Adj R*) obtained when each of the scales in one variable set were regressed onto all of the variables in the other set. As seen in Table 4, there were few one-to-one correspondences between the Filipino social and physical attribute dimensions and the dimensions of the Big Five model. Rather, most of the social and physical attribute dimensions were moderately related to multiple Big Five dimensions. Possible exceptions include Dangerousness, which was inversely associated with Big Five Agreeableness, and Respectability, which was strongly related to both Big Five Conscientiousness and Agreeableness. Least well predicted by the Big Five dimensions were two dimensions that are defined largely by physical attribute terms (i.e., Attractiveness and Presentableness) and a dimension defined by evaluation terms (i.e., Uniqueness). This is sensible because the Big Five model does not include dimensions for physical attributes or purely evaluative terms. Finally, inspection of the *Adj R* values in Table 4 reveals that the social and physical attribute dimensions as a set again did a better job of predicting the trait dimensions than vice-versa. This indicates that there is personality-relevant content in many of the social and physical attribute dimensions, and that some of the content in these dimensions is not well represented in the Big Five model.

As seen in Table 5, most of the relationships between the Filipino social and physical attribute dimensions and the HEXACO dimensions were similar to those found with the Big Five model. However, it is noteworthy that the Strength dimension exhibits better one-to-one correspondence with HEXACO Emotionality than with Big Five Emotional Stability. In addition, Dangerousness no longer exhibits one-to-one correspondence with Agreeableness, which refers more narrowly to even temper in the HEXACO model. As with the Big Five

⁵In Table 3, as well as in Tables 4—6, we report Pearson correlations rather than β weights from the regression analyses, because we wished to show the zero-order relationships or mapping of the social and physical attribute dimensions onto the dimensions of the alternative trait models (rather than the unique or incremental contributions of each predictor dimension). However, because the dimensions in the various trait models were correlated to some extent, we also examined the β weights in each analysis. The Pearson *r*'s and regression β weights led to the same conclusions about scale convergence, however, so we do not report the β weights.

model, the Uniqueness and Presentableness dimensions were rather independent of the HEXACO dimensions, whereas the Attractiveness dimension was predicted slightly better by the HEXACO dimensions than by the Big Five dimensions. The personality-relevance of the social and physical attribute dimensions is again seen by the substantial *Adj R* values seen in Table 5 for each of the HEXACO scales.

Previous studies of Filipino trait terms have not identified a distinct dimension that corresponds to a narrow version of HEXACO Honesty-Humility. Rather, terms for honesty and humility have consistently blended with altruism terms to form the Filipino Concern for Others versus Egotism dimension. Thus, it is of particular interest whether any of the social and physical attribute dimensions resemble an Honesty-Humility dimension. The best candidate is Respectability, which correlated .56 ($p < .01$) with the Honesty-Humility marker scale. Indeed, the Respectability scale contains a number of terms for social roles or effects that could be associated with trait Honesty-Humility, for example, *may-dangal* (honorable) and *nakakadaya* (able to swindle others), but other terms are less clearly so (e.g., *nakikinig* [a good listener], *nakatitiis* [able to endure hardship]). Furthermore, the Respectability dimension was not specifically associated with Honesty-Humility. It was also highly correlated with HEXACO Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

As seen in Table 6, most of the social and physical attribute dimensions—as they did in the comparisons with the Big Five and HEXACO models—showed modest to moderate correlations with multiple ML7 dimensions. The primary exception was Strength, which showed good one-to-one correspondence with ML7 Self-Assurance. What is new here, relative to the Big Five and HEXACO models, is the addition of the ML7 Negative Valence dimension, which showed substantial correspondence with Uselessness.⁶ Because the ML7 dimensions do not include a Positive Valence dimension or dimensions of physical attributes, the Uniqueness, Attractiveness, and Presentableness dimensions are again among the least well predicted social and physical attribute scales (see *Adj R* values). Again, the personality-relevance of many social and physical attribute dimensions is indicated by the substantial *Adj R* values seen in Table 6 for each of the ML7 scales.

Canonical analyses—Canonical analysis can be used to quantify the degree of overlap or redundancy between two sets of variables. In the present study, the social and physical attribute dimensions comprised one set of variables in each analysis and each of the alternative trait models, in turn, comprised the second set. Table 7 provides a summary of the results of these analyses. In canonical analysis, canonical weights (analogous to β weights in multiple regression) are derived for the variables in each of two sets of variables such that the (canonical) correlation between the weighted sums for the two sets of variables is maximized. As in factor analysis, successive canonical variates or roots are extracted, each orthogonal to the others, with each additional variate accounting for additional shared variance between the two variable sets. The number of canonical variates is equal to the number of variables in the smaller set of variables, but the canonical correlations for some of the variates may not be statistically significant. The canonical correlations themselves do not provide a definitive index of overlap or redundancy between the two sets of variables, because it is possible to obtain relatively high canonical correlations between two best-weighted variates, even when they do not extract significant portions of variance from their respective variable sets (Stewart & Love, 1968). Instead, Stewart and Love (1968) proposed an index of redundancy, which is derived by summing, for each canonical variate, the squared canonical loadings (i.e., the correlations of each variable with its weighted variate) across all variables in a set, multiplying these sums by

⁶The evaluative nature of the Uselessness dimension is also supported by the following: It was the only social and physical attribute dimension whose item distributions exhibited substantial skew (i.e., greater than 1.5). That is, most respondents rated themselves low on the very negative characteristics associated with this dimension.

the respective squared canonical correlations, and summing these products across all of the canonical variates. A separate index of redundancy is obtained for each of the two sets of variables and can be interpreted as the proportion of variance in one of the variable sets explained or accounted for by the variables in the other variable set.⁷

In the canonical analyses summarized in the top half of Table 7, one set of variables was always the social and physical attribute scales, while the second set was the variable set for the trait model listed in the first column. For example, when one set of variables was the social and physical attribute dimensions and the other set was the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions, 8 of the 9 possible canonical variates were statistically significant and the significant canonical correlations ranged from .20 to .86 (Mean $R_c = .55$). The redundancy or proportion of variance in the social and physical attribute variables accounted for by the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions was .32. Inversely, the proportion of variance in the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions accounted for by the social and physical attribute dimensions was .45. Because most of the trait models do not include evaluative dimensions (except for the ML7 model), the second row in Table 7 shows the extent of overlap between the social and physical attributes and the Filipino trait dimensions alone (i.e., without the Positive and Negative Valence scales).

The number and size of the significant canonical correlations in Table 7 suggest that the social and physical attribute dimensions exhibit considerable redundancy or overlap with the various trait models. The redundancy estimates in the top half of Table 7 reveal that in each canonical analysis, the social and physical attribute dimensions accounted for more variance in the trait models than vice-versa. In particular, while the social and physical attribute scales as a set generally accounted for about 40-50% of the variance in the trait models, the trait models accounted for about 25-35% of the variance in the social and physical attribute dimensions. This suggests that the social and physical attribute dimensions are broader in scope than the trait models. The social and physical attribute dimensions refer to characteristics that are relevant to personality traits, but also person-descriptive characteristics that go beyond traits.

Of course, the trait models do not include physical attributes and some do not include evaluative dimensions. Therefore, we repeated the canonical analyses after excluding the primarily physical (Attractiveness, Presentableness) and evaluative (Uselessness, Uniqueness) dimensions. That is, only Prominence, Respectability, Destructiveness, Strength, Dangerousness, and Charisma comprised the social attribute set that was related to the various trait models. As seen in the bottom half of Table 7, this more restricted set of social attribute dimensions accounted for about 10% less of the variance in the various trait models, as compared to the canonical analyses with all ten social and physical attribute dimensions. After the primarily physical and evaluative dimensions were excluded, the remaining social attribute variables and the trait variables predicted each other about equally well (see the similar redundancy values in the bottom half of Table 7). These results again indicate that the social attribute dimensions contain information that is relevant to personality traits. The inverse is also true: Personality traits can predict self-perceptions of one's social roles, statuses, and effects to a moderate extent. The degree of redundancy or overlap between the two sets of variables is substantial, comprising about $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total variance, depending on the variable set and which social and physical attribute dimensions are included. The two categories of person-descriptors are not completely redundant, however, because substantial proportions of variance in each variable set are not accounted for by the other.

⁷Stewart and Love (1968) noted that the redundancy indices computed in this manner will be equal to the average of the squared multiple correlations obtained for a variable set when each variable is regressed onto all of the variables in the other variable set simultaneously.

Discussion

Previous lexical studies have focused primarily on stable trait terms. However, like a number of other lexical researchers, we argued that more complete taxonomies of person description will result from examining additional person-descriptive categories (Goldberg, 1982; John et al., 1988; Saucier, 1997). Saucier (2003) and Goldberg and Somer (2000), in the English and Turkish languages, respectively, analyzed broader sets of familiar person descriptors, but neither study reported dimensions of social or physical attributes separately. Previously, dimensions of Filipino trait and evaluative terms (Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1998) and Filipino affect terms (Church et al., 1999) have been investigated, but this was the first structural study of Filipino terms for personality-relevant social roles, statuses, and effects, plus physical attributes.

Filipino Dimensions of Social and Physical Attributes

Church et al. (1996) identified 3,037 Filipino terms for social roles, statuses, and effects, as compared to an initial list of 1,297 terms for stable personality traits and mental abilities. However, based on the judgments of the Filipino informants in the present study, we can conclude that only a small proportion of these terms are viewed as having clear and direct implications for personality. Indeed, after eliminating some “root-redundant” terms, some ambiguous and gender-specific terms, and some terms that were unfamiliar to many college students, only 224 personality-relevant social and physical attribute terms remained. This compares with the 861 terms used in the initial structural study of Filipino trait terms (Church et al., 1997) and the 171 primary terms used in the lexical studies of Filipino affect or emotion (Church, Katigbak, Reyes, & Jensen, 1998, 1999). Together, these results indicate that the majority of personality-relevant Filipino adjectives are found in the category of stable traits. Nonetheless, it is important to determine whether any new dimensions can be identified when additional categories of person description are included.

We identified ten dimensions of social and physical attributes, which we labeled Prominence, Uselessness, Attractiveness, Respectability, Uniqueness, Destructiveness, Presentableness, Strength, Dangerousness, and Charisma. Because other lexical researchers have not reported factors for these domains of person description separately, we are limited in our ability to make cross-language comparisons. Saucier (1997) and Goldberg and Somer (2000), in analyses of familiar English and Turkish person-descriptive terms, respectively, identified a comparable Attractiveness dimension. Saucier's (1997) Attractiveness factor was defined by terms such as beautiful, good-looking, gorgeous, attractive, glamorous, appealing, lovely, adorable, and fascinating. Goldberg and Somer's (2000) Attractiveness factor was defined by such terms as pleasant, graceful, attractive, eye-catching, charming, and influential. Thus, in both of these studies, as in the present study, the Attractiveness factor was defined by terms for physical attributes, as well as social evaluations or effects. To confirm the resemblance of the Filipino Attractiveness dimension to the Attractiveness dimensions in these earlier studies, we constructed marker scales comprised of Filipino translations of high-loading ($>.30$) Attractiveness terms in the Saucier (1997) and Goldberg and Somer (2000) studies. The 13-item marker scale for the Saucier (1997) Attractiveness dimension ($\alpha = .79$) correlated .93 with the Filipino Attractiveness scale, while the 12-item marker scale for the Goldberg and Somer (2000) Attractiveness dimension ($\alpha = .66$) correlated .71 with the Filipino Attractiveness scale. Clearly, an Attractiveness factor can be obtained in a variety of cultures by incorporating terms for social and physical attributes.⁸

⁸In the German language, Henss (1998) also identified an Attractiveness factor in an analysis of bipolar adjective scales specifically constructed to measure such a dimension, and found that this factor was moderately correlated (r 's in the .50s) with gender-linked factors in an analysis of type nouns (e.g., lady-killer, sex bomb).

We also observed conceptual resemblances between the Filipino dimensions for social roles and effects and many of Goldberg's (1982) conceptually-derived categories for social roles, relationships, and effects in the English language. In particular, Filipino Prominence appears to encompass terms in Goldberg's Fame, Influence, Popularity, and Affluence categories. Filipino Uselessness (inversely) resembles Goldberg's Competence category. Close conceptual correspondences are also apparent between Filipino Attractiveness and Goldberg's Attractiveness, and between Filipino Respectability and Goldberg's Respect. Filipino Charisma seems to encompass much of Goldberg's Interest, Charm, and Entertainment-value categories, and some terms in Goldberg's Interest category also overlap with Filipino Uniqueness. Filipino Dangerousness resembles Goldberg's Dominance, Fearsomeness, and Antagonism categories, and Filipino Destructiveness also overlaps with Goldberg's Antagonism. Not surprisingly, two Filipino dimensions that are defined primarily by physical attribute terms, Strength and Presentableness, do not appear to correspond closely to any of Goldberg's categories of social roles and effects (although Goldberg's Fashion category includes "presentable" as a term). A number of Goldberg's smaller categories, including Nurturance, Succorance, Adjustment, Clarity, Accountability, Forgivability, Fashion, Politics, Sex, and Religion do not exhibit much conceptual resemblance to the Filipino dimensions of social and physical attributes. We should note that we did not attempt to construct marker scales for Goldberg's (1982) conceptual categories and their self-report structure in the English language is unknown. Overall, however, our conceptual comparison suggests that there is a good deal of cross-cultural similarity in the major categories of social roles and effects, and that some of Goldberg's more refined conceptual categories might combine into broader dimensions in self-report data.

Relation to Filipino Trait and Evaluative Dimensions

Using joint component and regression analyses, we showed that most of the social and physical attribute dimensions were moderately to strongly related to one or more Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions. The clearest exception was the small Presentableness dimension. Despite the personality-relevance judgments of our Filipino informants, the Presentableness dimension, which was comprised of physical appearance attributes (e.g., presentable, clean vs. dirty), may provide less information about personality than the other social and physical attribute dimensions. In addition, the Prominence and Attractiveness dimensions—more than the other social and physical attribute dimensions—appear to address characteristics that are fairly distinct conceptually from the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions.

The correlations found between most of the social dimensions and the trait attribute dimensions suggest that terms for social roles, statuses, and effects may reflect social outcomes associated with particular personality traits. Indeed, Angleitner et al. (1990) suggested that social roles and statuses reflect the impact that traits have on other people. For example, Filipinos who have Gregariousness traits are likely to be described by themselves and others in terms of the social attributes that comprise the Charisma dimension (e.g., causes joy or happiness). Similarly, Filipinos who have Conscientiousness traits are likely to be described in terms of Respectability social attributes (e.g., respectable, honorable). These possible links between traits and social reputations could be tested directly in future research by correlating self-ratings on the trait dimensions with observer ratings on the social and physical attribute dimensions.

An applied implication of our results is that not too much would be lost by assessing only the Filipino trait and evaluative dimensions. Indeed, given the results of the joint component analysis (Table 2), some terms for social and physical attributes could even be added to existing trait and evaluative scales. However, if one were to add additional dimensions, beyond the trait and evaluative dimensions, the most likely candidates would be Prominence and Attractiveness. The Prominence scale would assess self-perceived social standing or status, while the Attractiveness scale would assess self-perceived physical attractiveness and charm.

In particular, given the relationship of self-perceived attractiveness to subjective well-being (Diener, Wolsic, & Fujita, 1995), and body image to both self-esteem and eating disorders (Mintz & Betz, 1988), the Attractiveness dimension could provide an important addition in clinical assessment.

Relation to Alternative Models of Personality Structure

Lexical researchers have not yet derived structural models for social and physical attribute terms. Therefore, we used existing trait models, including the Big Five, HEXACO, and ML7 models, as the primary basis for determining whether Filipino social and physical attribute dimensions add anything new to the broader domain of person description beyond traits. Our canonical analyses also enabled us to determine the extent to which the social and physical attributes—which were judged by cultural informants to be personality-relevant—indeed provided information about personality. Our results supported several conclusions.

First, in the Filipino language, extending the scope of lexical studies to include social and physical attributes does not result in dimensions that are largely independent of trait models. This was evident in the finding that most of the social and physical attribute dimensions could be predicted fairly well from the trait dimensions as sets (i.e., all of the Big Five, HEXACO, or ML7 dimensions). In general, the Attractiveness, Presentableness, and Uniqueness dimensions—two of which were defined largely by physical attribute terms and the third by positive evaluation terms—were least well predicted by the three trait models, and thus appear to provide the most distinct or independent categories of person-description relative to these trait models.

Second, although most of the social and physical attribute dimensions did not correspond to the trait dimensions in a one-to-one manner, it was clear from the canonical analyses that the two sets of dimensions exhibit considerable redundancy or overlap. Thus, although the social and physical attribute terms and dimensions may not refer to personality traits per se, they do contain information that is relevant to, or associated with, personality. By knowing something about individuals' social roles or the impact they have on others—for example, their perceived Respectability, Strength, Uniqueness, or Charisma—some valid predictions can be made about their personality traits. The inverse is also true: Personality traits can predict self-perceptions of one's social roles, statuses, and effects to a moderate extent.

Finally, the two categories of person-descriptors were not entirely redundant, indicating that each provides a considerable degree of unique information about a person. This means that there is value in including both types of dimensions in a more comprehensive assessment of individual differences. We are not suggesting that social and physical attribute dimensions should be incorporated into existing models of personality trait structure such as the Big Five, HEXACO, or ML7 models. However, our results reveal that the inclusion of additional categories of person description, such as social and physical attributes, can lead to a more comprehensive taxonomy of *person perception* or *person description* categories in various languages and cultures.

Final Comments

Although our sample was large, it would be beneficial to replicate these social and physical attribute dimensions in additional Filipino samples. The current results were based only on the self-ratings of young college students. In addition, the social and physical attribute terms were limited to those that Filipino informants judged to be personality-relevant. It is possible that there will be differences in the characteristics judged relevant to personality, character, or ability by informants in different cultures. In addition, although we intentionally eliminated characteristics that some psychologists would view as outside the purview of personality

psychology (i.e., those not judged to be personality-relevant), it would also be of interest to investigate the structure of the broader domain of social roles, status, and effects. Finally, the cross-cultural generalizability of our conclusions regarding the extent of correspondence and redundancy between trait, evaluative, and social and physical attribute dimensions will remain uncertain until lexical researchers in other languages report similar studies. The outcome of such studies will likely be more comprehensive taxonomies of person-descriptive attributes and firmer conclusions about the generalizability of person-descriptive categories or dimensions across cultures.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by National Institute of Health grants MH47343 and MH59941. We are grateful to Benita M. Laurena, Leonila B. Sigue, Jr., Roman Perez, Gloria de Castro-Bernas, Carrie Villena-Saban, and Helena F. Cabrera for assistance in data collection in the Philippines.

References

- Almagor M, Tellegen A, Waller NG. The Big Seven model: A cross-cultural replication and further exploration of the basic dimensions of natural language trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1995;69:300–307.
- Allport GW, Odbert HS. Trait-names: A psycholexical study. *Psychological Monographs* 1936;47(No 211)
- Angleitner, A.; Ostendorf, F. Personality factors via self- and peer-ratings based on a representative sample of German trait descriptive terms. Paper presented at the First European Congress of Psychology; Amsterdam. 1989 Jul.
- Angleitner A, Ostendorf F, John OP. Towards a taxonomy of personality descriptors in German: A psycho-lexical study. *European Journal of Personality* 1990;4:89–118.
- Ashton MC, Lee K. A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality* 2001;15:327–353.
- Ashton MC, Lee K. Six independent factors of personality variation: A response to Saucier. *European Journal of Personality* 2002;16:63–75.
- Ashton MC, Lee K. Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2007;11:150–166. [PubMed: 18453460]
- Ashton MC, Lee K, Goldberg LR. A hierarchical analysis of 1,710 English personality-descriptive adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2004;87:707–721. [PubMed: 15535781]
- Ashton MC, Lee K, Marcus B, de Vries RE. German lexical personality factors: Relations with the HEXACO model. *European Journal of Personality* 2007;21:23–43.
- Ashton MC, Lee K, Perugini M, Szarota P, de Vries RE, Di Blas L, Boies K, De Raad B. A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: Solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2004;86:356–366. [PubMed: 14769090]
- Benet V, Waller NG. The Big Seven model of personality description: Evidence for its cross-cultural generality in a Spanish sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1995;69:701–718.
- Benet-Martínez V, Waller NG. Further evidence for the cross-cultural generality of the ‘Big Seven’ model: Imported and indigenous Spanish personality constructs. *Journal of Personality* 1997;65:567–598.
- Benet-Martínez V, Waller NG. From *adorable* to *worthless*: Implicit and self-report structure of highly evaluative personality descriptors. *European Journal of Personality* 2002;16:1–41.
- Caprara GV, Perugini M. Personality described by adjectives: The generalizability of the Big Five to the Italian lexical context. *European Journal of Personality* 1994;8:357–369.
- Church, AT.; Katigbak, MS. Personality structure across cultures: Indigenous and cross-cultural perspectives. In: Hampson, S.; Borkenau, P.; Elias, A.; Hampson, S.; De Raad, B., editors. *Advances in personality psychology*. Vol. 2. London: Psychology Press; 2005. p. 139-178.(Series Eds.) (Vol Eds.)

- Church AT, Katigbak MS, Reyes JAS. Toward a taxonomy of trait adjectives in Filipino: Comparing personality lexicons across cultures. *European Journal of Personality* 1996;10:3–24.
- Church AT, Katigbak MS, Reyes JAS. Further exploration of Filipino personality structure using the lexical approach: Do the Big-Five or Big-Seven dimensions emerge? *European Journal of Personality* 1998;12:249–269.
- Church AT, Katigbak MS, Reyes JAS, Jensen SM. Language and organization of Filipino emotion concepts: Comparing emotion concepts and dimensions across cultures. *Cognition and Emotion* 1998;12:63–92.
- Church AT, Katigbak MS, Reyes JAS, Jensen SM. The structure of affect in a non-western culture: Evidence for cross-cultural comparability. *Journal of Personality* 1999;67:505–534. [PubMed: 10483119]
- Church AT, Reyes JAS, Katigbak MS, Grimm SD. Filipino personality structure and the Big Five model: A lexical approach. *Journal of Personality* 1997;65:477–528. [PubMed: 9327587]
- De Raad B. The replicability of the Big Five personality dimensions in three word-classes of the Dutch language. *European Journal of Personality* 1992;6:15–29.
- De Raad B, Hendriks AAJ, Hofstee WKB. Towards a refined structure of personality traits. *European Journal of Personality* 1992;6:301–319.
- Diener E, Wolsic B, Fujita F. Physical attractiveness and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1995;69:120–129.
- Eagly AH, Ashmore RD, Makhijani MG, Longo LC. What is beautiful is good, but...: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin* 1991;110:109–128.
- Feingold A. Good-looking people are not what we think. *Psychological Bulletin* 1992;2:304–341.
- Goldberg, LR. Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In: Wheeler, L., editor. *Review of personality and social psychology*. Vol. 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage; 1981. p. 141-165.
- Goldberg, LR. From Ace to Zombie: Some explorations in the language of personality. In: Spielberger, CD.; Butcher, JN., editors. *Advances in personality assessment*. Vol. 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1982. p. 203-234.
- Goldberg LR. An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1990;59:1216–1229. [PubMed: 2283588]
- Goldberg LR, Somer O. The hierarchical structure of common Turkish person-descriptive adjectives. *European Journal of Personality* 2000;14:497–531.
- Henns R. Type nouns and the five factor model of personality description. *European Journal of Personality* 1998;12:57–71.
- Hřebíčková, M.; Ostendorf, F.; Angleitner, A. Basic dimensions of personality description in the Czech language. Poster session presented at the 7th meeting of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences; Warsaw. 1995 Jul.
- John OP, Angleitner A, Ostendorf F. The lexical approach to personality: A historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality* 1988;2:171–203.
- Kanagawa C, Cross SE, Markus HR. “Who am I?”: The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 2001;27:90–103.
- Katigbak MS, Church AT, Guanzon-Lapeña MA, Carlota AJ, del Pilar GH. Are indigenous personality dimensions culture specific? Philippine inventories and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2002;82:89–101. [PubMed: 11811638]
- Markus HR, Kitayama S. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review* 1991;98:224–253.
- McCrae RR, Costa PR Jr. Positive and negative valence within the five-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality* 1995;29:443–460.
- Mintz LB, Betz NE. Prevalence and correlates of eating disordered behaviors among undergraduate women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 1988;35:463–471.
- Norman, WT. 2800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population. University of Michigan; Ann Arbor: 1967. Unpublished manuscript

- Ostendorf, F. Sprache und persönlichkeitsstruktur: Zur validität des fünf-faktoren-modells der persönlichkeit [Language and personality structure: Toward the validation of the five-factor model of personality]. Resenburg, Germany: S. Roderer Verlag; 1990.
- Russell JA. Culture and the categorization of emotions. *Psychological Bulletin* 1991;110:426–450. [PubMed: 1758918]
- Saucier G. Effects of variable selection on the factor structure of person descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1997;73:1296–1312. [PubMed: 9418281]
- Saucier G. Gone too far—or not far enough? Comments on the article by Ashton and Lee (2001). *European Journal of Personality* 2002;16:55–62.
- Saucier G. An alternative multi-language structure for personality attributes. *European Journal of Personality* 2003;17:179–205.
- Saucier G, Goldberg LR. Evidence for the Big Five in analyses of familiar English personality adjectives. *European Journal of Personality* 1996;16:55–62.
- Saucier G, Goldberg LR. What is beyond the Big Five? *Journal of Personality* 1998;66:495–524. [PubMed: 9728415]
- Saucier, G.; Simonds, J. The structure of personality and temperament. In: Mroczek, DK.; Little, TD., editors. *Handbook of personality development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2006. p. 109-128.
- Schmitt DP, Buss DM. Sexual dimensions of person description: Beyond or subsumed by the Big Five? *Journal of Research in Personality* 2000;34:141–177.
- Stewart D, Love W. A general canonical correlation index. *Psychological Bulletin* 1968;70:160–163. [PubMed: 5681306]
- Szirmak Z, De Raad B. Taxonomy and structure of Hungarian personality traits. *European Journal of Personality* 1994;8:95–118.
- Tellegen A. Folk concepts and psychological concepts of personality and personality disorder. *Psychological Inquiry* 1993;4:122–130.
- Watson D, Tellegen A. Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin* 1985;98:219–235. [PubMed: 3901060]

Table 1
Terms with the Largest Factor Loadings for the Filipino Personality-relevant Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions

English (Filipino)	Loading
I Prominence	
Famous (<i>tanyag</i>)	0.65
Popular (<i>popular</i>)	0.64
Well-known (<i>sikat</i>)	0.64
Known (<i>kilala</i>)	0.62
Powerful (<i>makapangyarihan</i>)	0.61
Famous (<i>bantog</i>)	0.53
Expert (<i>batikan</i>)	0.51
Having advantage over another (<i>nakahihigit</i>)	0.49
Well-trained (<i>dalubhasa</i>)	0.48
Influential (<i>maimpluwensiya</i>)	0.46
Superior (<i>superyor</i>)	0.45
Unsurpassable (<i>di-madaig</i>)	0.43
Aristocrat (<i>aristokratiko</i>)	0.41
II Uselessness	
W/out education (<i>walang-edukasyon</i>)	0.65
W/out friends (<i>walang-kaibigan</i>)	0.62
W/out a future (<i>walang-kinabukasan</i>)	0.61
W/out honor (<i>walang-dangal</i>)	0.56
Useless (<i>walang-pakinabang</i>)	0.56
Untidy (<i>gusgusin</i>)	0.54
Loathsome (<i>nakapandidiri</i>)	0.50
W/out ambition (<i>walang-hangarin</i>)	0.48
W/out use (<i>walang-silbi</i>)	0.45
Incapable (<i>walang-kapasidad</i>)	0.45
Useless (<i>bale-wala</i>)	0.44
W/out honor (<i>walang-puri</i>)	0.43
III Attractiveness	
Charming (<i>nakabibighani</i>)	0.72
Attractive (<i>kaakit-akit</i>)	0.71
Attractive (<i>atraktibo</i>)	0.66
Handsome (<i>gwapo</i>)	0.61
Beautiful (<i>maganda</i>)	0.58
Seductive (<i>mapang-akit</i>)	0.58
Desirable (<i>kaibig-ibig</i>)	0.55

English (Filipino)	Loading
Desirable (<i>maalindog</i>)	0.52
Tempting (<i>kahali-halina</i>)	0.51
Beautiful (<i>marikit</i>)	0.50
Ugly (<i>pangit</i>)	-0.42
Charmless (<i>walang-alindog</i>)	-0.39
IV Respectability	
Respectable (<i>kagalang-galang</i>)	0.45
Not seductive (<i>di-mapang-akit</i>)	0.40
Good listener (<i>nakikinig</i>)	0.40
Model (<i>uliran</i>)	0.39
Successful (<i>matagumpay</i>)	0.38
Trusting (<i>may-tiwala</i>)	0.36
Able to endure hardship (<i>nakatitiis</i>)	0.36
Honorable (<i>may-dangal</i>)	0.35
Trouble-maker (<i>panligalig</i>)	-0.44
Bossy (<i>mautos</i>)	-0.39
Abusive (<i>abusero</i>)	-0.37
Promiscuous (<i>pakawala</i>)	-0.35
V Uniqueness ^a	
Incomparable (<i>walang-katulad</i>)	0.70
Matchless (<i>walang-kapareho</i>)	0.70
Having no equal (<i>walang-kaparis</i>)	0.68
Cannot be imitated (<i>di-maparisan</i>)	0.63
Incomparable (<i>inkumparable</i>)	0.52
Different (<i>naiiba</i>)	0.51
Distinctive (<i>namumukod</i>)	0.50
W/out peer or equal (<i>walang-kasukat</i>)	0.49
Different (<i>iba</i>)	0.41
Having many friends in one's group (<i>mabarkada</i>)	-0.36
Common (<i>karaniwan</i>)	-0.34
VI Destructiveness vs. Presentableness ^a	
Destructive (<i>tagasira</i>)	0.46
Dirty, unclean (<i>di-malinis</i>)	0.41
Detestable to one's liking or taste (<i>nakakasuya</i>)	0.40
Destructive (<i>nakakasira</i>)	0.39
Oppressed (<i>api</i>)	0.38

English (Filipino)	Loading
Causing desperation (<i>nakaaaburido</i>)	0.37
A person who is easily fooled (<i>ululin</i>)	0.36
Presentable (<i>presentable</i>)	-0.47
Trustworthy (<i>pinagkakatiwalaan</i>)	-0.45
Clean, tidy (<i>malinis</i>)	-0.38
VII Strength	
Swift (<i>matulin</i>)	0.43
Strong (<i>malakas</i>)	0.40
W/ voice (<i>may-tinig</i>)	0.32
W/out vigor or strength (<i>walang-lakas</i>)	-0.58
Weak, not firm (<i>walang-tibay</i>)	-0.47
W/out force (<i>walang-pwersa</i>)	-0.44
Not strong or durable (<i>di-matibay</i>)	-0.39
Lacking confidence (<i>walang-kompiyansa</i>)	-0.35
W/out a voice (<i>walang-tinig</i>)	-0.34
Easily tired (<i>mahapuin</i>)	-0.34
Inexperienced (<i>walang-eksperyensa</i>)	-0.34
VIII Dangerousness	
Causes failure or injury (<i>pahamak</i>)	0.41
Instigates another (<i>tagasulol</i>)	0.41
Cheater (<i>magulang</i>)	0.39
Causes fear (<i>nakakatakot</i>)	0.38
Dangerous (<i>mapanganib</i>)	0.37
Needing constant guidance (<i>akayin</i>)	0.36
Causes annoyance (<i>nakabwibwisit</i>)	0.36
Causes anger to someone (<i>nakagalit</i>)	0.33
Forceful (<i>mapwersa</i>)	0.32
Arouses suspicion (<i>kahina-hinala</i>)	0.32
IX Charisma ^a	
Interesting, getting fond/familiar (<i>nakakawili</i>)	0.67
Entertaining (<i>nakakaaliw</i>)	0.63
Causes joy or happiness (<i>nakatutuwa</i>)	0.56
Makes someone happy (<i>nakagalak</i>)	0.48
Gives satisfaction or contentment (<i>nakasisiya</i>)	0.46
Lovely, charming (<i>kagiliw-giliw</i>)	0.34

^aThe signs of the loadings for these components were reversed to agree with the component label.

Table 2
Terms with the Largest Factor Loadings for Joint Trait, Evaluative and Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions

English (Filipino)	Loading
I Conscientiousness	
Studious (<i>palaaral</i>) [Consc]	0.53
Diligent (<i>masikap</i>) [Consc]	0.52
Conscientious (<i>matiyaga</i>) [Consc]	0.51
Hard-working (<i>masipag</i>) [Consc]	0.50
Frugal (<i>masinop</i>) [Consc]	0.48
Thrifty (<i>matipid</i>) [Consc]	0.46
Not pampered (<i>walang-layaw</i>) [Resp]	0.40
Respectable (<i>kagalang-galang</i>) [Resp]	0.39
Idle, Truant (<i>bulakbol</i>) [-Consc]	-0.52
Spendthrift (<i>gastador</i>) [-Consc]	-0.52
Wanderer (<i>gala</i>) [-Consc]	-0.48
Extravagant (<i>maluho</i>) [-Consc]	-0.47
Hard-headed (<i>matigas ang ulo</i>) [-Consc]	-0.46
Fond of company of the group (<i>mabarkada</i>) [-Uniq]	-0.38
II Self-Assurance	
Strong-willed (<i>malakas ang loob</i>) [SA]	0.53
Active (<i>alisto</i>) [SA]	0.52
Brave (<i>matapang</i>) [SA]	0.51
Focused, decided (<i>desidido</i>) [SA]	0.49
Alert (<i>alerto</i>) [SA]	0.49
Durable, strong (<i>matibay</i>) [SA]	0.47
Swift (<i>matulin</i>) [S vs W]	0.45
Weak (<i>mahina</i>) [-SA]	-0.51
Coward (<i>duwag</i>) [-SA]	-0.49
W/out strength (<i>walang-lakas</i>) [-Str]	-0.48
Slow (<i>mabagal</i>) [-SA]	-0.46
W/out strength (<i>walang-tibay</i>) [-Str]	-0.46
III Appeal	
Famous (<i>sikat</i>) [Prom]	0.65
Popular (<i>tanyag</i>) [Prom]	0.61
Popular (<i>popular</i>) [Prom]	0.60
Known (<i>kilala</i>) [Prom]	0.58
Attractive (<i>kaakit-akit</i>) [Attract]	0.57
Charming (<i>nakabibighani</i>) [Attract]	0.57

English (Filipino)	Loading
Attractive (<i>atraktibo</i>) [Attract]	0.56
Powerful (<i>makapangyarihan</i>) [Prom]	0.54
Superb (<i>Napakahusay</i>) [PV]	0.53
Well-known (<i>bantog</i>) [Prom]	0.48
Admirable (<i>kahanga-hanga</i>) [PV]	0.47
Commendable (<i>kapuri-puri</i>) [PV]	0.41
IV Uselessness	
W/out education (<i>walang-edukasyon</i>) [Use]	0.54
W/out a future (<i>walang-kinabukasan</i>) [Use]	0.52
Useless (<i>walang-kuwenta</i>) [Use]	0.52
Worthless (<i>walang-silbi</i>) [Use]	0.48
W/out friends (<i>walang-kaibigan</i>) [Use]	0.48
Person wasting his life (<i>patapon</i>) [Use]	0.47
W/out honor (<i>walang-dangal</i>) [Use]	0.45
Snob (<i>mataray</i>) [Temp]	-0.52
Surly, crabby (<i>masungit</i>) [Temp]	-0.51
Easily hurt (<i>Tampuhin</i>) [Temp]	-0.47
V Concern for Others vs. Egotism	
Caring (<i>mapagmalasakit</i>) [CFO]	0.46
Trustworthy (<i>pinagkakatiwalaan</i>) [-Destr]	0.45
Nice, kind (<i>mabait</i>) [CFO]	0.45
Open-hearted (<i>bukas-loob</i>) [CFO]	0.45
Thoughtful (<i>maasikaso</i>) [CFO]	0.44
Generous (<i>mapagkaloob</i>) [CFO]	0.38
Causes failure or injury (<i>pahamak</i>) [Danger]	-0.45
Causes annoyance (<i>nakakaaburido</i>) [Danger]	-0.44
Cheater (<i>magulang</i>) [Annoy]	-0.43
Bossy (<i>mapaghari-harian</i>) [-CFO]	-0.42
Provoking (<i>nakakagalit</i>) [Danger]	-0.39
VI Gregariousness ^a	
Noisy (<i>maingay</i>) [Greg]	0.57
Likes to laugh (<i>halakhakin</i>) [Greg]	0.56
Likes to smile (<i>ngitiin</i>) [Greg]	0.55
Likes to laugh (<i>palatawa</i>) [Greg]	0.55
Joker (<i>mapagpatawa</i>) [Greg]	0.54
Likes to get around (<i>galawgaw</i>) [Greg]	0.53

English (Filipino)	Loading
Joyful, merry (<i>masayahin</i>) [Greg]	0.52
Likes to tell stories (<i>makuwento</i>) [Greg]	0.52
Gregarious (<i>kalog</i>) [Greg]	0.52
Amusing (<i>nakakaaliw</i>) [Charis]	0.44
Interesting (<i>nakakawili</i>) [Charis]	0.43
Causing happiness (<i>nakasisiya</i>) [Charis]	0.40
Quiet (<i>tahimik</i>) [-Greg]	-0.57
VII Uniqueness ^a	
Incomparable (<i>walang-katulad</i>) [Uniq]	0.66
Matchless (<i>walang-kapareho</i>) [Uniq]	0.64
Different (<i>kakaiba</i>) [PV]	0.62
Having no equal (<i>walang-kaparis</i>) [Uniq]	0.61
Unique (<i>bukod-tangi</i>) [PV]	0.60
Extraordinary (<i>ekstraordinaryo</i>) [PV]	0.58
Cannot be imitated (<i>di- maparisan</i>) [Uniq]	0.55
Stands out (<i>namumukod</i>) [Uniq]	0.54
Distinctive (<i>katangi-tangi</i>) [PV]	0.52
Different (<i>naiiba</i>) [Uniq]	0.51
Special (<i>espesyal</i>) [PV]	0.44
VIII Intellect/Openness	
Has intelligence (<i>may-talino</i>) [Intell]	0.46
Has value, worth (<i>may-halaga</i>) [PV]	0.41
Has brains (<i>may-utak</i>) [Intell]	0.38
Has conscience (<i>may-budhi</i>) [CFO]	0.38
Has brains/smart (<i>may-ulo</i>) [Intell]	0.37
Able to listen (<i>nakikinig</i>) [Resp]	0.37
Caring (<i>makalinga</i>) [CFO]	0.35
Generous (<i>mapag-bigay</i>) [CFO]	0.32
Oppressed (<i>daig-daigan</i>) [-Str]	-0.34

Note. Trait and evaluative dimensions: CFO = Concern for Others vs. Egotism; Consc = Conscientiousness; Relig = Religiosity; Greg = Gregariousness; Intell = Intellect; PV = Positive Valence; Temp = Temperamentalness; SA = Self-Assurance. Social and physical attribute dimensions: Prom = Prominence; Use = Uselessness; Attract = Attractiveness; Resp = Respectability; Uniq = Uniqueness; Destr = Destructiveness; Charis = Charisma; Str = Strength; Danger = Dangerousness.

^aThe signs of the loadings for these components were reversed to agree with the component label.

Table 3
Pearson Correlations between Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions and Trait and Evaluative Dimensions

Social and physical attribute scales	Trait scales							Evaluative scales			
	Self-Assurance	Conscientiousness	Concern for Others	Intellect	Temperamentality	Gregariousness	Religiosity	Adj R	Positive Valence	Negative Valence	Adj R
Prominence	.37**	.13**	-.04	.34**	-.34**	.01	-.06	.50	.33**	-.02	.55
Uselessness	.18**	.30**	.26**	-.10	-.41**	-.40**	.13**	.57	-.23	.62**	.76
Attractiveness	.14**	.09*	.06	.37**	-.18**	.10*	.05	.40	.40**	-.14**	.47
Respectability	.28**	.66**	.59**	.28**	-.39**	-.34**	.35**	.73	.20**	-.21**	.75
Uniqueness	-.01	-.07	-.13**	.11*	-.02	.07	-.06	.14	.64**	-.22*	.69
Destructiveness	-.16**	-.19**	-.23**	-.25**	.06	.01	-.18**	.39	-.27**	.35**	.50
Presentableness	.10*	.12**	.12**	.15**	-.21**	-.15**	.12**	.22	.05	.03	.22
Strength	.70**	.18**	.12**	.32**	-.34*	.13**	-.06	.73	.11*	.17**	.73
Dangerousness	-.17**	-.26**	-.53**	-.21**	.25**	.08	-.33**	.58	-.25**	.22**	.62
Charisma	.15**	.09*	.23**	.17**	-.29**	.33**	.03	.54	.25**	-.09	.57
Adj R	.75	.73	.73	.55	.73	.62	.44		.74	.71	

Note. The left-most column labeled *Adj R* shows the adjusted multiple correlations derived by regressing each social and physical attribute scale onto all of the trait scales simultaneously. The far-right column shows the *Adj R* values obtained when each social and physical attribute dimension was regressed on all of the trait and evaluative dimensions simultaneously. Inversely, the *Adj R* values in the bottom row of the table were obtained by regressing each trait or evaluative dimension onto all of the social and physical attribute dimensions simultaneously.

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

Table 4
Pearson Correlations between Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions and the Big Five Model

Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions	Big Five Dimensions					Emotional Stability vs. Neuroticism	Adj R
	Conscientiousness	Agreeableness	Surgey/Extraversion	Intellect/Openness			
Prominence	.21**	.10*	.21**	.38**		.44**	.51
Uselessness	.21**	.26**	-.24**	-.34**		-.30**	.59
Attractiveness	.15**	.15**	.16**	.35**		.20**	.39
Respectability	.65**	.64**	-.21**	.12**		.19**	.73
Uniqueness	-.02	-.05	-.05	.16**		.06	.17
Destructiveness	-.25**	-.25**	-.05	-.32**		-.05	.41
Presentableness	.12**	.18**	-.08*	.06		.20**	.24
Strength	.33**	.16**	.49**	.44**		.50**	.68
Dangerousness	-.37**	-.55**	.02	-.17**		-.07	.59
Charisma	.17**	.30**	.36**	.17**		.16**	.49
Adj R	.75	.77	.66	.61		.69	

Note. The adjusted multiple correlations (*Adj R*) in the right-most column were obtained by regressing each Filipino social and physical attribute dimension onto all of the Big Five scales. The *Adj R* values in the bottom row were obtained by regressing each Big Five scale onto all of the social and physical attribute dimensions.

**
 $p < .01$.

*
 $p < .05$.

Table 5
Pearson Correlations between Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions and the HEXACO Model

HEXACO Dimensions						
	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotionality	Openness to Experience	Honesty-Humility
Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions						
Prominence	.15**	.10**	.22**	-.34**	.36**	.06
Uselessness	-.31**	.35**	.27**	-.28**	-.30**	.22**
Attractiveness	.18**	.12**	.17**	-.10*	.42**	.10*
Respectability	-.21**	.52**	.60**	-.16**	.01	.56**
Uniqueness	-.07	-.04	.07	-.01	-.21**	-.02
Destructiveness	-.05	-.18**	-.27**	.05	-.26**	-.27**
Presentableness	-.07	.18**	.16**	-.14**	.11*	.06*
Strength	.30**	.13**	.31**	-.60**	.26**	.15**
Dangerousness	-.04	-.40**	-.37**	.02	-.06	-.40**
Charisma	.37**	.29**	.13**	-.10*	.16**	.23**
Adj R	.57	.69	.73	.69	.52	.65

Note. The adjusted multiple correlations (*Adj R*) in the right-most column were obtained by regressing each Filipino social and physical attribute dimension onto all of the Big Five scales. The *Adj R* values in the bottom row were obtained by regressing each Big Five scale onto all of the social and physical attribute dimensions.

**
 $p < .01$.

*
 $p < .05$.

Table 6
Pearson Correlations between Filipino Social and Physical Attribute Dimensions and the Multi-Language Seven (ML7) Model

Social and physical attribute dimensions	ML7 Dimensions							Adj R
	Even-temper	Gregariousness	Self-Assurance	Concern for Others	Conscientiousness	Intellect	Negative Valence	
Prominence	.32**	.07	.34**	-.08*	.08*	.22**	-.08*	.46
Uselessness	.33**	-.34**	-.17**	-.24**	-.19**	-.11**	.51**	.64
Attractiveness	.16**	.13**	.13**	-.02	.07*	.32**	-.16**	.39
Respectability	.33**	-.26**	.15**	.49**	.53**	.23**	-.01	.65
Uniqueness	.05	.05	.03	-.21**	-.08*	.11**	-.15**	.26
Destructiveness	-.04	-.01	-.11**	-.15**	-.20**	-.14**	.28**	.37
Presentableness	.17**	-.06	.11**	.05	.14**	.10*	-.07	.20
Strength	.28**	.17**	.65**	.04	.15**	.18**	.01	.66
Dangerousness	-.22**	.00	-.04	-.39**	-.34**	-.18**	.09*	.49
Charisma	.27**	.31**	.13**	.10*	.08*	.14**	-.05	.45
Adj R	.63	.53	.69	.60	.59	.41	.54	

Note. The adjusted multiple correlations (*Adj R*) in the right-most column were obtained by regressing each Filipino social and physical attribute dimension onto all of the Big Five scales. The *Adj R* values in the bottom row were obtained by regressing each Big Five scale onto all of the social and physical attribute dimensions.

**
 $p < .01$.

*
 $p < .05$.

Proportion of Overlapping Variance (Redundancy) between Social and Physical Attribute Scales and Alternative Trait Models

Model or variable set	Number of significant (<i>p</i> < .05) canonical variates	Size range of significant canonical correlations	Mean <i>R</i> _c	Redundancy	
				Social and physical attributes	Alternative model or variable set
Complete set of social and physical attributes included					
Filipino trait and evaluation dimensions	8 of 9	.20 - .86	.55	.38	.47
Filipino trait dimensions	6 of 7	.32 - .85	.56	.32	.45
Big five	5 of 5	.28 - .84	.58	.27	.50
Hexaco	6 of 6	.16 - .82	.49	.26	.43
ML7	6 of 7	.20 - .79	.51	.24	.34
Restricted set of social attributes					
Filipino trait and evaluation dimensions	6 of 6	.24 - .83	.53	.40	.34
Filipino trait dimensions	6 of 6	.20 - .80	.49	.36	.37
Big five	5 of 5	.18 - .81	.49	.35	.42
Hexaco	4 of 6	.30 - .77	.56	.32	.34
ML7	5 of 6	.28 - .74	.48	.29	.25

Note. For the restricted set of social attributes in the lower half of the table, two primarily physical dimensions (Attractiveness, Presentableness) and two primarily evaluative dimensions (Uselessness, Uniqueness) were excluded from the social attributes in the canonical analyses.