Published in final edited form as:

Biol Psychol. 2018 July ; 136: 111–118. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.05.017.

Extraversion, neuroticism, and the electrocortical response to monetary rewards in adolescent girls

Brittany C. Speed¹, Brady D. Nelson¹, Amanda R. Levinson¹, Greg Perlman², Daniel N. Klein¹, Roman Kotov², and Greg Hajcak³

¹Stony Brook University, Department of Psychology, Stony Brook, NY, USA

²Stony Brook University, Department of Psychiatry, Stony Brook, NY, USA

³Department of Psychology and Biomedical Sciences, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Abstract

Affective personality traits, such as extraversion and neuroticism, are associated with individual differences in reward system functioning. The reward positivity (RewP) is an event-related potential (ERP) component that indexes sensitivity to reward, and can be elicited by feedback indicating monetary gains relative to losses. In a sample of 508 adolescent girls, the current study examined the relationship between extraversion, neuroticism, and their respective facets and the RewP. Results indicated an Extraversion x Neuroticism interaction, such that greater extraversion was associated with an increased RewP, but only in the context of low neuroticism. This association was primarily due to the extraversion facet positive emotionality—high levels of positive emotionality were associated with an increased RewP, but only in the context of low neuroticism. In addition, increased neuroticism diminished the age-related increase in the RewP. The current study suggests that both extraversion and neuroticism are associated with reward system function in adolescence.

Keywords

reward positivity; extraversion; positive emotionality; neuroticism; adolescence

Adolescence is a transformative period, characterized by significant biological and psychosocial changes that are necessary for the transition into adulthood (Petersen, Crockett, Richards, & Boxer, 1988); it is also a period characterized by increased risk for

Address correspondence to: Brittany C. Speed, Department of Psychology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, 11794–2500, USA. brittcspeed@gmail.com.

¹To examine whether the associations between extraversion and neuroticism were replicated using parental report of the participant's personality, we conducted a simultaneous linear regression to examine the association between informant reported adolescent personality (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, and their interaction) in relation to the RewP, including participant age as a mean-centered continuous covariate. Extraversion or neuroticism, or their interaction were not associated with the RewP (p s > .30). Notably, correlations between self and informant report of extraversion, neuroticism and their facets was moderate (r s range from 0.37 – 0.60), suggesting that participants own report of their personality was more directly associated with the RewP.

²To determine whether reward processing was related to the other broad personality traits in the big five inventory, partial correlations were examined between the RewP to openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, while controlling for age. There were no significant associations between the RewP and the other big five personality traits (p s > .36).

psychopathology (Lewinsohn, Hops, Roberts, Seeley, & Andrews, 1993). In particular, increased affective and behavioral responsiveness to rewarding stimuli is a defining feature of adolescence (Galvan et al., 2006; Luking, Luby, & Barch, 2014; Silverman, Jedd, & Luciana, 2015; Spear, 2011). For example, neuroimaging research has demonstrated that striatal response to monetary rewards peaks between the ages of 12 and 15 (Van Leijenhorst et al., 2010). At the same time, risk for first-onset depression increases dramatically in mid-adolescence, particularly for females (Avenevoli, Swendsen, He, Burstein, & Merikangas, 2015). In light of these important and co-occurring developmental changes, a growing body of research has examined associations between depression, risk for depression, and neural response to rewards during this sensitive period. Cumulative evidence suggests that a blunted neural response to rewards is a promising biomarker of risk for depression (Bress, Foti, Kotov, Klein, & Hajcak, 2013; Luking, Pagliaccio, Luby, & Barch, 2016; Morgan, Olino, McMakin, Ryan, & Forbes, 2013; Nelson, Perlman, Klein, Kotov, & Hajcak, 2016; Olino et al., 2014).

Event-related potentials (ERPs) are an effective tool to study individual differences in reward responsiveness because they are a direct measure of neural activity with excellent temporal resolution. The ERP response to rewards is often evaluated using guessing tasks (e.g. the doors task; for a review see Proudfit, 2015), where the participant is required to make a selection that can result in a monetary gain or loss. Distinct reward-related ERP components are maximal at frontocentral sites approximately 300 ms following feedback: the reward positivity (RewP) observed as a relative positivity following gain feedback and the feedback negativity (FN) observed as a relative negativity following loss feedback, with the difference between gains and losses referred to as the RewP (Bress & Hajcak, 2013; Carlson, Foti, Mujica-Parodi, Harmon-Jones, & Hajcak, 2011; Foti, Weinberg, Dien, & Hajcak, 2011; Holroyd, Pakzad-Vaezi, & Krigolson, 2008). Previous research has found that the RewP is associated with self-report (Bress & Hajcak, 2013), behavioral (Bress & Hajcak, 2013), and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI; Becker, Nitsch, Miltner, & Straube, 2014; Carlson et al., 2011; Foti, Carlson, Sauder, & Proudfit, 2014) measures of reward responsiveness. The RewP is clearly evident in children, adolescents and adults, and psychometric evaluations demonstrate good internal consistency (Levinson, Speed, Infantolino, & Hajcak, 2017; Marco-Pallares, Cucurell, Münte, Strien, & Rodriguez-Fornells, 2011) and test-retest reliability (Bress et al., 2015; Levinson et al., 2017; Segalowitz, Santesso, Murphy, Homan, & Chantzianoniou, 2010), making it an ideal tool to study individual differences across development. In regards to age-related differences in the

RewP across childhood and adolescence, Hämmerer and colleagues (2011) demonstrated that RewP magnitude follows an inverted U pattern across the lifespan, peaking during adolescence and declining through adulthood. Consistent with Hammerer et al. (2011) and neuroimaging studies of reward sensitivity (Luking et al., 2014; Van Leijenhorst et al., 2010), recent evidence suggests that the RewP increases during adolescence (Sheffield et al., 2015), reflecting heightened reward processing during this period.

Consistent with fMRI findings of reduced amygdala activity to positive stimuli broadly (Canli et al., 2004; Mitterschiffthaler et al., 2003), and reduced activity in reward circuitry specifically (Pizzagalli, 2014), recent ERP studies have consistently shown that the RewP is blunted in depression, indicating reduced reward sensitivity (Bress et al., 2015; Bress,

Smith, Foti, Klein, & Hajcak, 2012; Foti & Hajcak, 2009; Foti, Weinberg, Bernat, & Proudfit, 2015). Furthermore, blunted RewP amplitude has been associated with specific depression symptoms that are negatively associated with positive emotionality, including anhedonia (Liu, Wang, Shang, Shen, Li, Cheung, & Chan, 2014) and impaired mood reactivity to positive events (Foti et al., 2014). Cumulative prospective evidence suggests that a blunted RewP precedes and predicts depressive symptomatology (Bress, Foti, Kotov, Klein, & Hajcak, 2013; Bress et al., 2015; Kujawa, Proudfit & Klein, 2014; Kujawa, Proudfit, Laptook, & Klein, 2015). Furthermore, a large study of adolescent girls with no lifetime history of depression found that a blunted RewP predicted first-onset depressive disorder and greater depressive symptoms at an 18 month follow-up independent of other established risk factors, including baseline depressive symptoms and adolescent and parental lifetime psychiatric history (Nelson, Perlman, Klein, Kotov, & Hajcak, 2016). To further evaluate the RewP as a stable biomarker of risk it is important to determine how the RewP may relate to other trait measures that are relatively stable across development and also associated with risk for depression.

Extraversion and neuroticism are two early-emerging, broad affective-personality traits linked to the onset and maintenance of depression (Davidson, 1992; Depue & Iacono, 1989; Gray, 1994; Lang, Bradley, & Cuthbert, 1990). Extraversion is broadly characterized by energetic engagement with the world, enhanced sociality, activity and positive emotionality (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008; Watson et al., 1994). Prior research has suggested that key facets of extraversion include positive emotionality, sociability, ascendance, and venturesomeness (Naragon-Gainey, Watson, & Markon, 2009; Simms, 2009; Shiner & Caspi, 2003). Evidence suggests that individuals high in extraversion are more sensitive to rewards (Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao, 2000; Olino, Klein, Durbin, Hayden, & Buckley, 2005). In contrast, neuroticism is conceptualized as the tendency to experience negative emotions, including emotional instability and heightened reactivity to stress and negative environmental stimuli (John et al., 2008; Watson et al., 1994). Past research supports the inclusion of three facets of neuroticism: trait hostility, anxiousness and melancholia (Naragon-Gainey et al., 2009; Simms, 2009). Given that depression is defined clinically as a dysfunction in mood that involves pronounced feeling of sadness and/or loss of pleasure in activities (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), depression involves the combination of high neuroticism and low extraversion, particularly positive emotionality, that remains stable even after remittance of depressive symptoms (De Fruyt, Van Leeuwen, Bagby, Rolland, & Rouillon, 2006; Ormel, Oldenhinkel, & Vollenberg, 2004). A large body of converging evidence supports this personality-based view of depression (Klein, Kotov, & Bufferd, 2011), and suggests that low extraversion is unique to depression while high neuroticism is common across internalizing psychopathology (Shankman & Klein, 2003).

In addition to developmental changes in reward system functioning during adolescence, there is evidence for co-occurring changes in extraversion and neuroticism during this important developmental period. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that adolescents display increasing extraversion and decreasing neuroticism with age (Roberts, Walton, Viechtbauer, 2006). Additionally, rank order stability of personality traits increases during adolescence (Aske, Hale, Engels, Raaijmakers, & Meeus, 2007; Klimstra et al., 2009; Pullmann et al., 2006; Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000), suggesting that these changes in extraversion and

neuroticism at the mean-level reflect normative development. Consistent with theoretical models of depression, longitudinal studies of personality and psychopathology in children suggest that lower extraversion predicts later internalizing symptoms, and that elevated neuroticism predicts later internalizing and externalizing symptoms (Rothbart & Bates, 1998). Notably, these associations are modest and the processes through which personality puts children at risk for psychopathology remains unclear.

Few studies have examined associations between broad personality traits (and their facets) and neural correlates of reward sensitivity, though preliminary evidence suggests a positive association between extraversion and reward sensitivity. For example, fMRI studies of adolescents and adults have found that greater extraversion was associated with increased activation in the ventral striatum and medial orbital frontal cortex following the receipt of reward (Cohen, Young, Baek, Kessler, & Ranganath, 2005; Forbes et al., 2010; Kennis et al., 2013; Simon et al., 2010). Conversely, greater behavioral inhibition (i.e. high neuroticism) has been associated with reduced activation in the ventral striatum following the receipt of reward (Simon et al., 2010). Previous studies in adults have found that more extraverted individuals display heightened reward responsiveness indexed by the RewP (Cooper, Duke, Pickering, & Smillie, 2014; Smillie, Cooper, & Pickering, 2011). A longitudinal study by Kujawa and colleagues (2015) found that laboratory observations of positive emotionality, a facet of extraversion, at age 3 predicted an enhanced RewP at age 9, but did not find associations between neuroticism and the RewP. Thus, preliminary evidence from children and adults suggests that extraversion, particularly positive emotionality, is associated with neural measures of reward processing, including the RewP. However, more research is needed to clarify if neuroticism or its facets are related to reward system functioning. In addition, it remains unclear how neuroticism and extraversion may be associated with the RewP during adolescence, a time where important changes in personality and reward sensitivity are taking place. Examining associations between personality traits that confer risk for depression and reward system activation during this sensitive period may aid in the identification of mechanistic processes that are implicated in the development of depression.

The current study examined the relationship between extraversion, neuroticism—and their respective facets—and the RewP in a large sample of adolescent girls with no lifetime history of depression. The current study utilized a sample of never-depressed adolescent girls for several reasons. First, we were able to examine the association between personality and the RewP without the obscuring effect of depression, which could alter both personality and reward sensitivity (Foti & Hajcak, 2009; Klein et al., 2011). Second, adolescence is a period characterized by divergent changes in extraversion and neuroticism (Roberts et al., 2006), increasing responsiveness to rewarding stimuli (Galvan et al., 2006; Luking et al., 2014; Silverman et al., 2015; Spear, 2000; Van Leijenhorst et al., 2010), and increasing risk for depression, especially for females (Avenevoli et al., 2015; Hankin et al., 1998). Therefore, this developmental window may be valuable for investigating the relationship between neural activity indexing reward sensitivity and personality traits linked to depression risk. Based on previous research which suggest opposing relationships between extraversion and neuroticism with reward responsiveness, we hypothesized that extraversion and neuroticism would interact to predict the RewP, specifically that high extraversion in the context of low neuroticism would be associated with a larger RewP

during a monetary guessing task. Furthermore, consistent with prior research we hypothesized that the association between extraversion and the RewP would be specific to the positive emotionality facet. As a result of the limited research on neuroticism and the RewP, we consider neuroticism facet analyses exploratory.

Due to the developmentally normative increase in reward sensitivity that occurs during adolescence, we examined the association between age and the neural response to gains and losses. Consistent with previous research, we hypothesized that age would be positively associated with the RewP. In addition, although it is well-established that reward system activation peaks in adolescence (Galvan et al., 2006; Luking et al., 2014; Silverman et al., 2015; Spear, 2000; Van Leijenhorst et al., 2011), it is unclear whether this developmentally normative increase is impacted by personality. Therefore, we conducted exploratory analyses examining whether the association of age and the RewP were moderated by extraversion, neuroticism, and their related facets.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 550 adolescent girls between the ages of 13.5–15.5 ($M = 14.39$, $SD = 0.63$) and a biological parent (93.1% mothers) who participated as part of the Adolescent Development of Emotions and Personality Traits (ADEPT) project. ADEPT is a longitudinal study of emotional and personality development and risk for depression, which focuses on early/mid adolescent girls because they are the demographic group at highest risk for developing depression (Avenevoli et al., 2015; Hankin et al., 1998). For the present study, data were taken from the initial assessment. Participant racial/ethnic background was 80.5% non-Hispanic Caucasian and 57.8% of parents had a bachelor's degree or greater.

Participants were recruited from the community using a commercial mailing list of homes with a daughter age 13–15 years, word of mouth, local referral sources (e.g., school districts), online classifieds, and postings in the community. Families were financially compensated for their participation. Inclusion criteria were fluency in English, able to read and understand questionnaires, and a biological parent willing to participate in the study. Exclusion criteria were a present or lifetime history of major depressive disorder (MDD), dysthymia, or intellectual disabilities. Lifetime history of MDD or dysthymia was determined using the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children, Present and Lifetime Version (Kaufman *et al.* 1997), which was administered by trained diagnostic interviewers closely supervised by clinical psychologists (R.K. and D.K.).

Personality

Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John et al., 2008).—

The BFI is a 44-item, factor-analytically derived self-report measure of broad personality traits: neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. Items are comprised of short descriptive statements that are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). Psychometric evaluations of the BFI

indicate good internal consistency, test-retest reliability and convergent and discriminant validity (John et al., 2008; Rammstedt & John, 2007). The current study focused on the extraversion (6 items) and neuroticism (8 items) scales, which were completed by the adolescent. See Table 1 for estimates of internal consistency in the current sample.

International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2007; Goldberg et al., 2006).—The IPIP was developed to provide a public-domain item pool to facilitate the self-report assessment of various personality characteristics. Items consist of short descriptive phrases and are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Evaluations of IPIP scales have indicated good internal consistency, as well as discriminant and convergent validity (Lim & Polyhart, 2006; Goldberg, 1999). The current study included 4 facets of extraversion, including cheerfulness (positive emotionality), assertiveness (ascendancy), friendliness (sociability), and excitement seeking (venturesomeness), and 3 facets of neuroticism, including hostility, sadness (melancholia) and anxiousness. Each facet scale was comprised of 10 items (70 items total), which were completed by the adolescent. See Table 1 for estimates of internal consistency in the current sample.

Reward Sensitivity

Doors Task.—The doors task was administered using Presentation software (Neurobehavioral Systems, Inc., Albany, CA, USA) on an Intel Core i5 class computer with a 21" monitor placed at eye level, at a distance of approximately 39", and was consistent with versions used in previous studies (Dunning & Hajcak, 2007; Foti & Hajcak, 2009, 2010; Proudfit, 2015). The task consisted of 3 blocks of 20 trials, separated by participant-timed breaks. Each trial began with the presentation of two identical doors, graphically displayed horizontally adjacent (the graphic occupied approximately 6° of the visual field vertically and 8° horizontally), centered in the screen. Participants were instructed to select the left or right door by clicking the left or right mouse button, respectively. Participants were told that they could either win \$0.50 or lose \$0.25 on each trial. These values were chosen in order to equalize the subjective value of the gains and losses (Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). The goal of the task was to guess which door hid the reward while attempting to earn as much money as possible. The image of the doors was presented until the participant made a selection. After stimulus offset, a fixation cross (+) was presented for 1000 ms, and feedback was then presented on the screen for 2000 ms. A gain was indicated by a green arrow pointing upward (↑) and a loss was indicated by a red arrow pointing downward (↓). The feedback stimulus was followed by a fixation cross presented for 1500 ms, immediately followed by the message "Click for next round." This prompt remained on the screen until the participant responded with a button press to initiate the next trial. All cues and feedback were presented in the center of the screen, on a black background and occupied approximately 3° of the visual field vertically and 1° horizontally. There were an equal number of gain and loss trials (30 each), such that participants had an equal likelihood of receiving gain and loss feedback throughout the task. Three practice trials were completed to ensure participants understood the instructions prior to beginning the task.

EEG Recording and Processing.—Continuous EEG was recorded using an elastic cap with 34 electrode sites placed according to the 10/20 system. Electrooculogram (EOG) was recorded using four additional facial electrodes: two placed approximately 1 cm outside of the right and left eyes and two placed approximately 1 cm above and below the right eye. All electrodes were sintered Ag/AgCl electrodes. Data were recorded using the ActiveTwo system (BioSemi, Amsterdam, Netherlands). The EEG was digitized with a sampling rate of 1024 Hz using a low-pass fifth order sinc filter with a half-power cutoff of 204.8 Hz. A common mode sense active electrode producing a monopolar (non-differential) channel was used as recording reference.

EEG data were analyzed using BrainVision Analyzer (Brain Products, Gilching, Germany). Data were referenced offline to the average of left and right mastoids, band-pass filtered (0.1 to 30 Hz), and corrected for eye movement artifacts (Gratton, Coles & Donchin, 1983). Feedback-locked epochs were extracted with a duration of 1000 ms, including a 200 ms pre-stimulus and 800 ms post-stimulus interval. The 200 ms pre-stimulus interval was used as the baseline. Epochs containing a voltage greater than 50 μ V between sample points, a voltage difference of 300 μ V within a segment, or a maximum voltage difference of less than 0.50 μ V within 100 ms intervals were automatically rejected. Additional artifacts were identified and removed based on visual inspection.

Feedback-locked ERPs were averaged separately for gains and losses, and the ERP response to gains (i.e., the RewP) and losses (i.e., the FN) were scored as the mean amplitude from 250–350 ms following feedback at FCz (Levinson et al., 2017; Luking, Nelson, Infantolino, Sauder, & Hajcak, 2017; Nelson et al., 2016), where the difference between gains and losses was maximal (see Figure 1). The average number of gain ($M = 29.92$, $SD = 0.81$) and loss ($M = 29.93$, $SD = 0.79$) trials included in ERP averages were proportionate. The RewP was then quantified as the difference between gain and loss trials (i.e., gain-loss).

Procedure

At the beginning of the visit, the participating parent gave their written informed consent and the adolescent gave their written informed assent to participate. Next, the EEG cap was set-up and the doors task was administered in the context of a battery of other tasks, with task order counterbalanced across participants. A set of computerized questionnaires including the BFI and IPIP was administered at the end of the visit. Breaks were provided throughout the visit, and small prizes were awarded after the completion of the EEG and questionnaires, respectively. At the end of the visit participants were paid their winnings from the doors task (\$7.50) and parents were compensated for their participation.

Data Analysis

A total of forty-two participants were excluded from analyses for either not completing the EEG recording ($n = 31$), outlier RewP values ($n = 2$; Hoaglin & Iglewicz, 1987; Tukey, 1977), or missing personality measures ($n = 9$), leaving a final sample of 508 participants. Pearson's correlations were conducted to examine the association between the personality traits and facets. Given that an essential criterion for conducting studies of trait-like individual differences is reliability in the measures used, the current study evaluated the

internal consistency of the RewP and the FN by computing split-half reliability between averages based on odd- and even-numbered trials using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula (Nunnally, Bernstein, & Berge, 1967). A mixed-measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted with outcome (gain vs. loss) as the repeated-measures factor and age as a covariate to examine the difference between the ERP response to gains and losses (i.e., the RewP) and their association with age. Simultaneous linear regression was employed to examine the association between adolescent personality (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, and their interaction) in relation to the RewP. Interactions between extraversion and neuroticism were followed-up by testing simple slopes of extraversion at low (-1 SD), average (mean), and high ($+1$ SD) levels of neuroticism. All significant trait analyses were followed-up by conducting identical analyses testing simple slopes using the extraversion (positive emotionality, ascendancy, sociability, venturesomeness) and neuroticism (hostility, anxiousness and melancholia) facets. Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) correction for multiple comparisons was used to adjust p values for facet-level analyses. All analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 22.0 (Armonk, NY, USA).

Results

Personality Measures

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the self-report measures of extraversion, neuroticism, and their related facets. The extraversion and neuroticism facets were moderately to strongly associated with their respective broader personality dimension ($r_s = .48$ to $.80$). Age was not associated with any personality dimension or facet ($p_s > .10$).

ERPs

The RewP ($r = .91$), FN ($r = .89$), and RewP ($r = .49$) achieved moderate to excellent internal consistency as assessed using split-half reliability. Figure 1 displays the waveforms and scalp distribution of the RewP during the doors task. As expected, the ERP response to gains and losses differed $F(1, 506) = 407.09, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .45$, such that the electrocortical response to monetary gains (i.e. RewP; $M = 17.34, SD = 9.43$) was more positive than the response to losses (i.e. FN; $M = 12.28, SD = 8.57$). There was also a main effect of age, $F(1, 506) = 5.86, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .01$, that was qualified by an Age x Outcome interaction, $F(1, 506) = 3.83, p = .05, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Follow-up analyses indicated age was positively associated with the RewP, $\beta = .09, t(507) = 1.96, p = .05$. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 2 the association between age and the RewP was primarily due to a positive association between age and the RewP ($r = .12, p < .01$) but not the FN ($r = .08, ns$).

For the personality and RewP analyses, age was included as a covariate to determine whether any associations were not better accounted for by the aforementioned relationship between age and the RewP. Extraversion and neuroticism were not independently associated with RewP magnitude ($p_s > .35$). As shown in Figure 3, there was an Extraversion x Neuroticism interaction, $\beta = -.83, t(507) = -2.26, p < .05$, such that greater extraversion was associated with an increased RewP at low levels of neuroticism, $\beta = .98, t(507) = 2.14, p < .05$, but not average, $\beta = .31, t(507) = 0.92, ns$, or high levels of

neuroticism, $\beta = -.37$, $t(507) = -.85$, *ns*. For the facet analyses, there was a Positive Emotionality x Hostility interaction, $\beta = -1.21$, $t(507) = -2.25$, $p < .05$, Positive Emotionality x Melancholia interaction, $\beta = -1.20$, $t(507) = -2.38$, $p < .05$, and Positive Emotionality x Anxiousness interaction, $\beta = -1.40$, $t(507) = -2.44$, $p < .05$. To determine which, if any, of the neuroticism facets uniquely interacted with positive emotionality to predict the RewP we conducted a simultaneous regression with age, positive emotionality, hostility, melancholia, anxiousness, Positive Emotionality x Hostility, Positive Emotionality x Melancholia, and Positive Emotionality x Anxiousness entered as independent variables. Results indicated that none of the neuroticism facets uniquely interacted with positively emotionality to predict the RewP ($ps > .25$), suggesting that the common variance of the higher order trait best accounted for these associations with positive emotionality. Indeed, there was a Positive Emotionality x Neuroticism interaction, $\beta = -1.31$, $t(507) = -2.30$, $p < .05$, such that greater positive emotionality was associated with an increased RewP in the context of low, $\beta = 2.02$, $t(507) = 2.81$, $p < .01$, and average levels of neuroticism, $\beta = 0.96$, $t(507) = 1.95$, $p = .05$, but not high levels of neuroticism, $\beta = -.11$, $t(507) = -0.18$, *ns* (see Figure 3). Results also indicated a Sociability x Anxiousness interaction, $\beta = -1.02$, $t(507) = -2.43$, $p < .05$, such that greater sociability was associated with an increased RewP at low levels of anxiousness, $\beta = 1.34$, $t(507) = 2.40$, $p < .05$, but not average, $\beta = .53$, $t(507) = 1.32$, *ns*, or high levels of anxiousness, $\beta = -.29$, $t(507) = -0.60$, *ns*. When age, positive emotionality, sociability, anxiousness, Positive Emotionality x Anxiousness, and Sociability x Anxiousness were simultaneously entered into a regression, neither Positive Emotionality x Anxiousness nor Sociability x Anxiousness remained significantly associated with the RewP ($ps > .21$), suggesting that the common variance in sociability and positive emotionality interacted with anxiousness to predict the RewP.

Next, we examined whether the association between age and the RewP differed as a function of personality. To this end, we conducted a linear regression that examined the association between age and extraversion, neuroticism, and their interaction in relation to the RewP. Age did not interact with extraversion to predict the RewP, $\beta = -.34$, $t(507) = -0.67$, *ns*. As shown in Figure 4, there was an Age x Neuroticism interaction, $\beta = -1.17$, $t(507) = -2.44$, $p < .05$, such that older age was associated with an increased RewP at low, $\beta = 1.74$, $t(507) = 3.11$, $p < .01$, and average levels of neuroticism, $\beta = .79$, $t(507) = 1.99$, $p < .05$, but not high levels of neuroticism, $\beta = -.16$, $t(507) = -0.29$, *ns*. Follow-up analyses with neuroticism facets indicated that the interaction between age and neuroticism was not better accounted for by a specific facet ($ps > .06$). In other words, greater neuroticism was associated with a disruption of the developmentally normative increase in the RewP.

Discussion

In a large sample of adolescent girls the current study examined interactions between broad affective personality traits and the RewP, an ERP measure of reward sensitivity. Results indicated that greater extraversion was associated with an increased RewP, but only in the context of low neuroticism. The interaction between personality measures was replicated and strengthened using a specific facet-level measure of extraversion: high levels of positive emotionality was associated with an increased RewP, but only in the context of low and average levels of neuroticism. In addition, the shared variance in the positive emotionality

and sociability facets of extraversion were positively associated with the RewP, but only in the context of low anxiousness. Finally, developmental analyses indicated a positive association between age and the RewP, and this relationship was modulated by neuroticism, such that increased neuroticism diminished the developmentally normative increase in the RewP.

The current study found that the largest RewP was observed in adolescent girls reporting both high extraversion and low neuroticism. The positive correlation between extraversion and the RewP, in the absence of neuroticism, is largely consistent with previous cross-sectional studies of the RewP and extraversion in adults, which suggest that extraversion is positively associated with RewP magnitude (Cooper et al., 2014; Smillie et al., 2011). Findings also overlap with a prospective study in children which found that a facet of extraversion - positive emotionality- at age 3 predicted an enhanced RewP at age 9 (Kujawa et al., 2015), indicating that positive emotionality and the RewP are positively associated both cross-sectionally and prospectively. The current study adds to this literature by revealing that in adolescent girls, neuroticism moderates this association between extraversion and the RewP, suggesting that increased neuroticism attenuates the positive association between the RewP and extraversion.

Facet-level analyses revealed that associations between extraversion, neuroticism, and the RewP were driven by the positive emotionality facet of extraversion, but not by any specific facets of neuroticism. Neuroimaging studies have suggested that neuroticism is related to decreased processing of pleasant stimuli (Canli et al., 2001; Kehoe et al., 2012), but few studies have specifically examined associations between neural correlates of reward and neuroticism, and none have examined associations between neural correlates of reward to specific facets of this broad trait. The current study suggests that for adolescent girls, the anxiousness facet modulates the relationship between sociability and positive emotionality facets and the RewP, with lower levels of anxiousness resulting in potentiation of the RewP when sociability and positive emotionality are high.

While the current study only included never-depressed adolescent girls, the findings are consistent with personality-based models of depression, which posit that vulnerability for depression is characterized by low levels of extraversion and high levels of neuroticism (Clark, 2005; Clark, Watson, & Mineka, 1994; Watson, Clark, & Harkness, 1994). Indeed, the current study found that in adolescent girls extraversion and neuroticism interact to predict the RewP, a neural biomarker of risk for depression (Bress, Foti, Kotov, Klein, & Hajcak, 2013; Bress et al., 2015; Kujawa, Proudfit & Klein, 2014; Kujawa, Proudfit, Laptook, & Klein, 2015). It is possible that interactions between extraversion and neuroticism may contribute to the development of depression in adolescent girls through their association with reward system functioning, and future research should evaluate this possibility directly. These results may help to further understand the development of depression, such that low extraversion paired with high neuroticism (Kendler, Gatz, Gardner, & Pedersen, 2006), and a blunted RewP (Bress et al., 2013; Bress et al., 2015) are preexisting risk factors for depression, and may allow for combining measures to facilitate the identification of at-risk youth for intervention prior to depression onset (Patrick et al., 2013). These findings suggest that risk for depression in adolescent girls may be broadly

characterized by reduced approach motivation, indicated by low extraversion (specifically positive emotionality) and blunted RewP, and elevated neuroticism. Indeed, this conceptualization is largely consistent with motivational models of depression (Davidson, 1992; Depue & Iacono, 1989; Gray, 1994; Lang et al., 1990; Watson et al., 1999). It is also consistent with prior ERP research suggesting that low positive emotionality may be associated with reduced engagement with emotional stimuli (Speed, Nelson, Perlman, Klein, Kotov, & Hajcak, 2015), and high neuroticism may be associated with a blunted neural response to emotional stimuli (Bartussek, Becker, Diedrich, Naumann, & Maier, 1996). However past research and the current study utilized a cross-sectional design, and longitudinal investigations are required to elucidate the relationship between the RewP, extraversion, neuroticism and the subsequent development of depression across adolescence.

The current study also found age-related variability in the RewP. Specifically, age was positively correlated with the neural response to gains; associations between age and the neural response to loss did not reach statistical significance, resulting in a larger RewP in older participants. These findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating that sensitivity to reward increases during adolescence (Galvan et al., 2006; Silverman et al., 2015; Sheffield et al., 2015; Spear, 2000), peaking between 12 and 15 years of age (Van Leijenhorst et al., 2010). However, this developmental trajectory was moderated by individual differences in neuroticism. When neuroticism was elevated the positive correlation between the RewP and age was significantly reduced. Given that the reward system continues to develop across adolescence, these cross-sectional findings suggest that personality traits might impact normative developmental processes. Indeed, there is evidence that neuroticism is positively associated with physiological stress, indexed by flattened cortisol rhythms across the waking day in adolescents (Hauner et al., 2008), and that stress in turn impacts reward system functioning (Bogdan & Pizzagalli, 2006; Zacharko et al., 1983), suggesting one possibility for how neuroticism may impact the RewP during this sensitive period.

There are limitations to the current study that warrant discussion. The sample was limited to 13.5–15.5 year-old girls, and findings may not generalize to boys or a different age group. In addition, the current study utilized a cross-sectional design; longitudinal studies are needed to further clarify developmental changes in the RewP and associations with personality. Finally, as expected given the lack of shared method variance (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Patrick et al., 2013), the significant effects reported in this study were relatively modest, and may not be observable in studies with smaller sample sizes. Notably, convergent evidence suggests that despite small effect sizes compared to psychosocial risk factors, neural measures such as the RewP capture unique variance in depression risk that may indicate mechanistic processes important to the development of the disorder (Proudfit, 2015; Proudfit, Bress, Foti, Kujawa, & Klein, 2015). For example, a recent study found that the RewP predicted first-onset depression in adolescent girls independent of other established risk factors, and provided incremental positive predictive value (Nelson et al., 2016), which may benefit in early identification and prevention efforts.

In sum, the current study found that high extraversion coupled with low neuroticism was associated with increased neural response to reward in a sample of adolescent girls. These

findings highlight the importance of evaluating interactions between affective traits that may have opposing associations with motivational systems and depression risk. Relationships between these broad affective traits and the RewP were mostly likely driven by the more specific facets of positive emotionality, sociability and anxiousness. Furthermore, neural response to rewards increased with age, though this relationship was reduced with increased neuroticism. Future research should examine if the association between extraversion, neuroticism, and the RewP generalizes to other populations, and whether individual differences in these personality traits modulate or mediate the relationship between the RewP and depression.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by National Institute of Mental Health grant R01 MH093479 awarded to R.K.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). DSM 5. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Ashton MC, Lee K, & Goldberg LR (2007). The IPIP-HEXACO scales: An alternative, public-domain measure of the personality constructs in the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(8), 1515–1526.
- Akse J, Hale WW III, Engels RCME, Raaijmakers QAW, & Meeus WHJ (2007). Stability and change in personality type membership and anxiety in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 813–834. [PubMed: 17234264]
- Avenevoli S, Swendsen J, He JP, Burstein M, & Merikangas KR (2015). Major depression in the National Comorbidity Survey–Adolescent Supplement: Prevalence, correlates, and treatment. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 54(1), 37–44. [PubMed: 25524788]
- Ball SA, & Zuckerman M (1990). Sensation seeking, Eysenck's personality dimensions and reinforcement sensitivity in concept formation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(4), 343–353.
- Bartussek D, Becker G, Diedrich O, Naumann E, & Maier S (1996). Extraversion, neuroticism, and event-related brain potentials in response to emotional stimuli. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20(3), 301–312.
- Becker MP, Nitsch AM, Miltner WH, & Straube T (2014). A single-trial estimation of the feedback-related negativity and its relation to BOLD responses in a time-estimation task. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 34(8), 3005–3012. [PubMed: 24553940]
- Benjamini Y, & Hochberg Y (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 57, 289–300.
- Block JH, Gjerde PF, & Block JH (1991). Personality antecedents of depressive tendencies in 18-year-olds: a prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(5), 726–738. [PubMed: 2072253]
- Bogdan R, & Pizzagalli DA (2006). Acute stress reduces reward responsiveness: implications for depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, 60(10), 1147–1154. [PubMed: 16806107]
- Bress JN, Foti D, Kotov R, Klein DN, & Hajcak G (2013). Blunted neural response to rewards prospectively predicts depression in adolescent girls. *Psychophysiology*, 50(1), 74–81. [PubMed: 23252717]
- Bress JN, & Hajcak G (2013). Self-report and behavioral measures of reward sensitivity predict the feedback negativity. *Psychophysiology*, 50(7), 610–616. [PubMed: 23656631]
- Bress JN, Meyer A, & Hajcak G (2015). Differentiating anxiety and depression in children and adolescents: Evidence from event-related brain potentials. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 44(2), 238–249. [PubMed: 23879474]

- Bress JN, Meyer A, & Proudfit GH (2015). The stability of the feedback negativity and its relationship with depression during childhood and adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*, 27(4pt1), 1285–1294. [PubMed: 26439074]
- Bress JN, Smith E, Foti D, Klein DN, & Hajcak G (2012). Neural response to reward and depressive symptoms in late childhood to early adolescence. *Biological Psychology*, 89(1), 156–162. [PubMed: 22015709]
- Campbell DT, & Fiske DW (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105. [PubMed: 13634291]
- Canli T, Sivers H, Thomason ME, Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Gabrieli JD, & Gotlib IH (2004). Brain activation to emotional words in depressed vs healthy subjects. *Neuroreport*, 15(17), 2585–2588. [PubMed: 15570157]
- Canli T, Zhao Z, Desmond JE, Kang E, Gross J, & Gabrieli JD (2001). An fMRI study of personality influences on brain reactivity to emotional stimuli. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 115(1), 33–42. [PubMed: 11256451]
- Carlson JM, Foti D, Mujica-Parodi LR, Harmon-Jones E, & Hajcak G (2011). Ventral striatal and medial prefrontal BOLD activation is correlated with reward-related electrocortical activity: A combined ERP and fMRI study. *Neuroimage*, 57(4), 1608–1616. [PubMed: 21624476]
- Carver CS, & Harmon-Jones E (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(2), 183–204. [PubMed: 19254075]
- Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Newman DL, & Silva PA (1996). Behavioral observations at age 3 years predict adult psychiatric disorders: Longitudinal evidence from a birth cohort. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 53(11), 1033–1039. [PubMed: 8911226]
- Clark LA (2005). Temperament as a unifying basis for personality and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114(4), 505. [PubMed: 16351374]
- Clark LA, Watson D, & Mineka S (1994). Temperament, personality, and the mood and anxiety disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103(1), 103–116. [PubMed: 8040472]
- Cohen MX, Young J, Baek JM, Kessler C, & Ranganath C (2005). Individual differences in extraversion and dopamine genetics predict neural reward responses. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 25(3), 851–861. [PubMed: 16289773]
- Cooper AJ, Duke É, Pickering AD, & Smillie LD (2014). Individual differences in reward prediction error: Contrasting relations between feedback-related negativity and trait measures of reward sensitivity, impulsivity and extraversion. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8, 1–11. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00248 [PubMed: 24474914]
- Corr PJ, Pickering AD, & Gray JA (1997). Personality, punishment, and procedural learning: A test of JA Gray's anxiety theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(2), 337–344. [PubMed: 9303949]
- Davidson RJ (1992). Anterior cerebral asymmetry and the nature of emotion. *Brain and Cognition*, 20(1), 125–151. [PubMed: 1389117]
- De Fruyt F, Van De Wiele L, & Van Heeringen C (2000). Cloninger's psychobiological model of temperament and character and the five-factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(3), 441–452.
- De Fruyt F, Van Leeuwen K, Bagby RM, Rolland JP, & Rouillon F (2006). Assessing and interpreting personality change and continuity in patients treated for major depression. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(1), 71–80. [PubMed: 16594814]
- Depue RA, & Collins PF (1999). Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(03), 491–517. [PubMed: 11301519]
- Depue RA, & Iacono WG (1989). Neurobehavioral aspects of affective disorders. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40(1), 457–492.
- Díaz A, & Pickering AD (1993). The relationship between Gray's and Eysenck's personality spaces. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15(3), 297–305.
- Dillon DG, Rosso IM, Pechtel P, Killgore WD, Rauch SL, & Pizzagalli DA (2014). Peril and pleasure: An RDOC-inspired examination of threat responses and reward processing in anxiety and depression. *Depression and Anxiety*, 31(3), 233–249. [PubMed: 24151118]

- Donnellan MB, Oswald FL, Baird BM, & Lucas RE (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(2), 192–203. [PubMed: 16768595]
- Dougherty LR, Klein DN, Durbin CE, Hayden EP, & Olinio TM (2010). Temperamental positive and negative emotionality and children's depressive symptoms: A longitudinal prospective study from age three to age ten. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(4), 462–488.
- Dunning JP, & Hajcak G (2007). Error-related negativities elicited by monetary loss and cues that predict loss. *Neuroreport*, 18(17), 1875–1878. [PubMed: 18090330]
- Elliot AJ, & Thrash TM (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 804–818. [PubMed: 12003479]
- Forbes EE, Ryan ND, Phillips ML, Manuck SB, Worthman CM, Moyles DL, ... & Dahl RE (2010). Healthy adolescents' neural response to reward: Associations with puberty, positive affect, and depressive symptoms. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 49(2), 162–172. [PubMed: 20215938]
- Foti D, Carlson JM, Sauder CL, & Proudfit GH (2014). Reward dysfunction in major depression: Multimodal neuroimaging evidence for refining the melancholic phenotype. *NeuroImage*, 101, 50–58. [PubMed: 24996119]
- Foti D, & Hajcak G (2009). Depression and reduced sensitivity to non-rewards versus rewards: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Biological Psychology*, 81(1), 1–8. [PubMed: 19162124]
- Foti D, & Hajcak G (2010). State sadness reduces neural sensitivity to nonrewards versus rewards. *Neuroreport*, 21(2), 143–147. [PubMed: 20010444]
- Foti D, Weinberg A, Bernat EM, & Proudfit GH (2015). Anterior cingulate activity to monetary loss and basal ganglia activity to monetary gain uniquely contribute to the feedback negativity. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 126(7), 1338–1347. [PubMed: 25454338]
- Foti D, Weinberg A, Dien J, & Hajcak G (2011). Event-related potential activity in the basal ganglia differentiates rewards from nonrewards: Temporospatial principal components analysis and source localization of the feedback negativity. *Human Brain Mapping*, 32(12), 2207–2216. [PubMed: 21305664]
- Fox NA, Henderson HA, Marshall PJ, Nichols KE, & Ghera MM (2005). Behavioral inhibition: Linking biology and behavior within a developmental framework. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 235–262.
- Gable SL, Reis HT, & Elliot AJ (2000). Behavioral activation and inhibition in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(6), 1135–1149. [PubMed: 10870914]
- Galvan A, Hare TA, Parra CE, Penn J, Voss H, Glover G, & Casey BJ (2006). Earlier development of the accumbens relative to orbitofrontal cortex might underlie risk-taking behavior in adolescents. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(25), 6885–6892. [PubMed: 16793895]
- Goldberg LR (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality Psychology in Europe*, 7(1), 7–28.
- Goldberg LR, Johnson JA, Eber HW, Hogan R, Ashton MC, Cloninger CR, & Gough HG (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 84–96.
- Gratton G, Coles MG, & Donchin E (1983). A new method for off-line removal of ocular artifact. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 55(4), 468–484. [PubMed: 6187540]
- Gray JA (1994). Framework for a taxonomy of psychiatric disorder In van Goozen SHM, Van de Poll NE, & Sergeant JA (Eds.), *Emotions: Essays on Emotion Theory* (29–59). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gray JA (1970). The psychophysiological basis of introversion-extraversion. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 8(3), 249–266. [PubMed: 5470377]
- Hämmerer D, Li S-C, Müller V, & Lindenberger U (2011). Life span differences in electrophysiological correlates of monitoring gains and losses during probabilistic reinforcement learning. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23, 579–592. doi:10.1162/jocn.2010.21475 [PubMed: 20377358]

- Hankin BL, Abramson LY, Moffitt TE, Silva PA, McGee R, & Angell KE (1998). Development of depression from preadolescence to young adulthood: Emerging gender differences in a 10-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107(1), 128–140. [PubMed: 9505045]
- Harmon-Jones E (2003). Anger and the behavioral approach system. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(5), 995–1005.
- Hauner KK, Adam EK, Mineka S, Doane LD, DeSantis AS, Zinbarg R, ... & Griffith JW (2008). Neuroticism and introversion are associated with salivary cortisol patterns in adolescents. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 33(10), 1344–1356. [PubMed: 18809259]
- Heubeck BG, Wilkinson RB, & Cologon J (1998). A second look at Carver and White's (1994) BIS/BAS scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(4), 785–800.
- Hoaglin DC, & Iglewicz B (1987). Fine-tuning some resistant rules for outlier labeling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(400), 1147–1149.
- Holroyd CB, Pakzad-Vaezi KL, & Krigolson OE (2008). The feedback correct-related positivity: Sensitivity of the event-related brain potential to unexpected positive feedback. *Psychophysiology*, 45(5), 688–697. [PubMed: 18513364]
- John OP, Donahue EM, & Kentle RL (1991). The big five inventory - Versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John OP, Naumann LP, & Soto CJ (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy In John OP, Robins RW, & Pervin LA (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (3rd ed, 114–158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Jorm AF, Christensen H, Henderson AS, Jacomb PA, Korten AE, & Rodgers B (1998). Using the BIS/BAS scales to measure behavioural inhibition and behavioural activation: Factor structure, validity and norms in a large community sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26(1), 49–58.
- Kaufman J, Birmaher B, Brent D, Rao UMA, Flynn C, Moreci P, ... & Ryan N (1997). Schedule for affective disorders and schizophrenia for school-age children-present and lifetime version (K-SADS-PL): Initial reliability and validity data. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36(7), 980–988. [PubMed: 9204677]
- Kehoe EG, Toomey JM, Balsters JH, & Bokde AL (2012). Personality modulates the effects of emotional arousal and valence on brain activation. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 7(7), 858–870. [PubMed: 21948954]
- Kendler KS, Gatz M, Gardner CO, & Pedersen NL (2006). Personality and major depression: A Swedish longitudinal, population-based twin study. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 63(10), 1113–1120. [PubMed: 17015813]
- Kennis M, Rademaker AR, & Geuze E (2013). Neural correlates of personality: An integrative review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(1), 73–95.
- Klein DN, Kotov R, & Bufferd SJ (2011). Personality and depression: Explanatory models and review of the evidence. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 7, 269–295.
- Klimstra TA, Hale III WW, Raaijmakers QA, Branje SJ, & Meeus WH (2009). Maturation of personality in adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(4), 898–912. [PubMed: 19309210]
- Kujawa A, Proudfit GH, Kessel EM, Dyson M, Olino T, & Klein DN (2015). Neural reactivity to monetary rewards and losses in childhood: Longitudinal and concurrent associations with observed and self-reported positive emotionality. *Biological Psychology*, 104, 41–47. [PubMed: 25433097]
- Kujawa A, Proudfit GH, & Klein DN (2014). Neural reactivity to rewards and losses in offspring of mothers and fathers with histories of depressive and anxiety disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 123(2), 287. [PubMed: 24886003]
- Kujawa A, Proudfit GH, Laptook R, & Klein DN (2015). Early parenting moderates the association between parental depression and neural reactivity to rewards and losses in offspring. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 3(4), 503–515. [PubMed: 26167423]
- Lang PJ, Bradley MM, & Cuthbert BN (1990). Emotion, attention, and the startle reflex. *Psychological Review*, 97(3), 377–395. [PubMed: 2200076]

- Levinson AR, Speed BC, Infantolino ZP, & Hajcak G (2017). Reliability of the electrocortical response to gains and losses in the doors task. *Psychophysiology*, 54(4), 601–607. doi:10.1111/psyp.12813 [PubMed: 28072462]
- Lewinsohn PM, Hops H, Roberts RE, Seeley JR, & Andrews JA (1993). “Adolescent psychopathology: I. Prevalence and incidence of depression and other DSM-III—R disorders in high school students”: Correction. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102(4), 517–518. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.102.4.517
- Lim BC, & Ployhart RE (2006). Assessing the convergent and discriminant validity of Goldberg’s International Personality Item Pool: A multitrait-multimethod examination. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 29–54.
- Liu WH, Wang LZ, Shang HR, Shen Y, Li Z, Cheung EF, & Chan RC (2014). The influence of anhedonia on feedback negativity in major depressive disorder. *Neuropsychologia*, 53, 213–220. [PubMed: 24316199]
- Lonigan CJ, Phillips BM, & Hooe ES (2003). Relations of positive and negative affectivity to anxiety and depression in children: Evidence from a latent variable longitudinal study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(3), 465–481. [PubMed: 12795571]
- Lucas RE, Diener E, Grob A, Suh EM, & Shao L (2000). Cross-cultural evidence for the fundamental features of extraversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(3), 452–468. [PubMed: 10981846]
- Luking KR, Luby JL, & Barch DM (2014). Kids, candy, brain and behavior: Age differences in responses to candy gains and losses. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 9, 82–92. [PubMed: 24534632]
- Luking KR, Nelson BD, Infantolino ZP, Sauder CL, & Hajcak G (2017). Internal consistency of functional magnetic resonance imaging and electroencephalography measures of reward in late childhood and early adolescence. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 2(3), 289–297. [PubMed: 29057369]
- Luking KR, Pagliaccio D, Luby JL, & Barch DM (2016). Reward processing and risk for depression across development. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(6), 456–468. [PubMed: 27131776]
- MacAndrew C, & Steele T (1991). Gray’s behavioral inhibition system: A psychometric examination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(2), 157–171.
- Marco-Pallares J, Cucurell D, Münte TF, Strien N, & Rodriguez-Fornells A (2011). On the number of trials needed for a stable feedback-related negativity. *Psychophysiology*, 48(6), 852–860. [PubMed: 21091959]
- Mitterschiffthaler MT, Kumari V, Malhi GS, Brown RG, Giampietro VP, Brammer MJ, ... & Sharma T (2003). Neural response to pleasant stimuli in anhedonia: An fMRI study. *Neuroreport*, 14(2), 177–182. [PubMed: 12598724]
- Morgan JK, Olino TM, McMakin DL, Ryan ND, & Forbes EE (2013). Neural response to reward as a predictor of increases in depressive symptoms in adolescence. *Neurobiology of Disease*, 52, 66–74. [PubMed: 22521464]
- Naragon-Gainey K, Watson D, & Markon KE (2009). Differential relations of depression and social anxiety symptoms to the facets of extraversion/positive emotionality. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 118(2), 299–310. doi: 10.1037/a0015637 [PubMed: 19413405]
- Nelson BD, Perlman G, Klein DN, Kotov R, & Hajcak G (2016). Blunted neural response to rewards as a prospective predictor of the development of depression in adolescent girls. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 173(12), 1223–1230. [PubMed: 27363510]
- Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH, & Berge JMT (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226): JSTOR.
- Olino TM, Klein DN, Durbin CE, Hayden EP, & Buckley ME (2005). The structure of extraversion in preschool aged children. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(2), 481–492.
- Olino TM, McMakin DL, Morgan JK, Silk JS, Birmaher B, Axelson DA, ... & Forbes EE (2014). Reduced reward anticipation in youth at high-risk for unipolar depression: A preliminary study. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 8, 55–64. [PubMed: 24369885]
- Ormel J, Oldehinkel AJ, & Vollebergh W (2004). Vulnerability before, during, and after a major depressive episode: A 3-wave population-based study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 61(10), 990–996. [PubMed: 15466672]

- Patrick CJ, Venables NC, Yancey JR, Hicks BM, Nelson LD, & Kramer MD (2013). A construct-network approach to bridging diagnostic and physiological domains: Application to assessment of externalizing psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 122(3), 902–916. [PubMed: 24016026]
- Petersen AC, Crockett L, Richards M, & Boxer A (1988). A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 17, 117–133. [PubMed: 24277579]
- Pizzagalli DA (2014). Depression, stress, and anhedonia: toward a synthesis and integrated model. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 10, 393–423.
- Polak-Toste CP, & Gunnar MR (2006). Temperamental exuberance: Correlates and consequences In Mashall P & Fox NA (Eds.), *The Development of Social Engagement: Neurobiological Perspectives* (19–45). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Proudfit GH (2015). The reward positivity: From basic research on reward to a biomarker for depression. *Psychophysiology*, 52(4), 449–459. [PubMed: 25327938]
- Proudfit GH, Bress JN, Foti D, Kujawa A, & Klein DN (2015). Depression and Event-Related Potentials: Emotional disengagement and reward insensitivity. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1(4), 110–113. Doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.018.
- Pullmann H, Raudsepp L, & Allik J (2006). Stability and change in adolescents' personality: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Personality*, 20, 447–459.
- Rammstedt B, & John OP (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 203–212.
- Roberts BW, & DelVecchio WF (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(1), 3–25. [PubMed: 10668348]
- Roberts BW, Walton KE, & Viechtbauer W (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(1), 1–25. [PubMed: 16435954]
- Rothbart MK, & Bates JE (1998). Temperament In Damon W (Series Ed.) & Eisenberg N (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th edition, pp. 105–176). New York: Wiley.
- Segalowitz SJ, Santesso DL, Murphy TI, Homan D, Chantziantoniou DK, & Khan S (2010). Retest reliability of medial frontal negativities during performance monitoring. *Psychophysiology*, 47(2), 260–270. [PubMed: 20030755]
- Shankman SA, & Klein DN (2003). The relation between depression and anxiety: An evaluation of the tripartite, approach-withdrawal and valence-arousal models. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23(4), 605–637. [PubMed: 12788112]
- Sheffield JG, Crowley MJ, Bel-Bahar T, Desatnik A, Nolte T, Fonagy P, & Fearon RP (2015). Reward-related neural activity and adolescent antisocial behavior in a community sample. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 40(6), 363–378. [PubMed: 26491989]
- Shiner R, & Caspi A (2003). Personality differences in childhood and adolescence: Measurement, development, and consequences. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 44(1), 2–32. [PubMed: 12553411]
- Silverman MH, Jedd K, & Luciana M (2015). Neural networks involved in adolescent reward processing: An activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies. *NeuroImage*, 122, 427–439. [PubMed: 26254587]
- Simms EE (2009). Assessment of the facets of the five factor model: Further development and validation of a new personality measure. The University of Iowa. Retrieved from <http://gradworks.umi.com/33/83/3383172.html>
- Simon JJ, Walther S, Fiebach CJ, Friederich HC, Stippich C, Weisbrod M, & Kaiser S (2010). Neural reward processing is modulated by approach-and avoidance-related personality traits. *Neuroimage*, 49(2), 1868–1874. [PubMed: 19770056]
- Smillie LD (2013). Extraversion and reward processing. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(3), 167–172.

- Smillie LD, Cooper AJ, & Pickering AD (2011). Individual differences in reward–prediction–error: Extraversion and feedback-related negativity. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 6(5), 646–652. [PubMed: 20855297]
- Spear LP (2011). Rewards, aversions and affect in adolescence: Emerging convergences across laboratory animal and human data. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 1(4), 390–403.
- Spear LP (2000). The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24, 417–463. [PubMed: 10817843]
- Speed BC, Nelson BD, Perlman G, Klein DN, Kotov R, & Hajcak G (2015). Personality and emotional processing: A relationship between extraversion and the late positive potential in adolescence. *Psychophysiology*, 52(8), 1039–1047. [PubMed: 25847353]
- Stallings MC, Hewitt JK, Cloninger CR, Heath AC, & Eaves LJ (1996). Genetic and environmental structure of the Tridimensional Personality Questionnaire: Three or four temperament dimensions?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(1), 127–140. [PubMed: 8558406]
- Tukey JW (1977). *Exploratory data analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tversky A, & Kahneman D (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297–323.
- Van Leijenhorst L, Zanolie K, Van Meel CS, Westenberg PM, Rombouts SA, & Crone EA (2010). What motivates the adolescent? Brain regions mediating reward sensitivity across adolescence. *Cerebral Cortex*, 20(1), 61–69. [PubMed: 19406906]
- Watson D, Clark LA, & Harkness AR (1994). Structures of personality and their relevance to psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103(1), 18–31. [PubMed: 8040477]
- Watson D, Wiese D, Vaidya J, & Tellegen A (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5), 820–838.
- Weinberg A, Riesel A, & Proudfit GH (2014). Show me the money: The impact of actual rewards and losses on the feedback negativity. *Brain and Cognition*, 87, 134–139. [PubMed: 24735733]
- Zacharko RM, Bowers WJ, Kokkinidis L, & Anisman H (1983). Region-specific reductions of intracranial self-stimulation after uncontrollable stress: Possible effects on reward processes. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 9(2), 129–141. [PubMed: 6603854]

Figure 1. ERP waveforms and 3D rendered scalp distribution of the mean activity of the RewP (i.e., gain-loss), scored as the average activity between 250–350 ms. ERP = event-related potential; ms = milliseconds; RewP = reward positivity.

Figure 2.
Trend lines depicting the association between age the ERP response to monetary gains and losses.

Figure 3.

Interaction between extraversion and neuroticism (top) and the facet positive emotionality and neuroticism (bottom) in relation to the Δ RewP at FCz. Significant simple slopes are marked on the graph * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. RewP = reward positivity; SD = standard deviation.

Figure 4.

Interaction between age and neuroticism in relation to the ΔRewP at FCz. Significant simple slopes are marked on the graph * $p < .05$ and ** $p < .01$. RewP = reward positivity; SD = standard deviation.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients for Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Related Facets

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Extraversion									
1. BFI Ext	-	.48	.66	.68	.47	-.26	-.22	-.26	-.28
2. IPIP Che		-	.40	.56	.40	-.30	-.34	-.29	-.43
3. IPIP Ast			-	.63	.36	-.22	-.19	-.23	-.25
4. IPIP Fri				-	.35	-.39	-.45	-.43	-.48
5. IPIP Exc					-	-.07	.00	-.16	.05
Neuroticism									
6. BFI Neu						-	.71	.80	.65
7. IPIP Hos							-	.76	.70
8. IPIP Aux								-	.63
9. IPIP Sad									
<i>M</i>	3.76	4.18	3.56	3.99	3.57	2.74	2.56	2.68	1.92
<i>SD</i>	0.78	0.54	0.79	0.70	0.67	0.81	0.86	0.80	0.85
Cronbach's α	.80	.76	.87	.86	.79	.84	.85	.83	.91

Note. All correlations greater than |.15| were significant at $p < .01$. Bold-faced type = r values $\geq .45$; Anx = anxiousness; Ast = assertiveness; BFI = Big Five Inventory; Che = cheerfulness; Exc = excitement seeking; Ext = extraversion; Fri = friendliness; IPIP = International Personality Item Pool; *M* = mean; Neu = neuroticism; Sad = sadness; *SD* = standard deviation.