



# The General Factor of Personality, BIS–BAS, expectancies of reward and punishment, self-esteem, and positive and negative affect

Stephen Erdle<sup>a,\*</sup>, J. Philippe Rushton<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Huron University College at the University of Western Ontario, 1349 Western Road, London, ON, Canada N6G 1H3

<sup>b</sup> University of Western Ontario, London, Canada

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 16 August 2009

Received in revised form 21 January 2010

Accepted 25 January 2010

### Keywords:

General Factor of Personality

BIS–BAS

Self-esteem

Positive and negative affect

Sex

Social desirability

## ABSTRACT

In two studies, we explore the neurobiological basis of the General Factor of Personality (GFP) by correlating it with measures of the Behavioral Inhibition System–Behavioral Activation System (BIS–BAS), generalized expectancies of reward and punishment, self-esteem, and positive and negative affect. The GFP was measured by aggregating across the scales of the Big Five Inventory (reverse keying Neuroticism to reflect Emotional Stability). Self-report measures from undergraduate students ( $N_s = 128, 88$ ) revealed a single GFP dimension with positive loadings on BAS, expectations of reward, self-esteem, and positive affect, and negative loadings on BIS, expectations of punishment, and negative affect. The results were robust, replicating across the studies, the sexes, and after controlling for social desirability. The measures of BIS–BAS, generalized expectancies, self-esteem, and positive and negative affect accounted for 59% and 56% of the variance in the GFP. BIS–BAS may provide a neurobiological basis of the GFP.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, increasing discussion has focused on the amount of overlap and redundancy found among measures of personality. Many researchers are becoming “lumpers” rather than “splitters” in the debate over broad versus specific traits. For example, in 12 studies ( $N = 15,000$ ) of four widely researched traits—self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy—Judge, Erez, and Bono (1998) found an average corrected inter-correlation of .60, with a single factor explaining 71% of the variance in these traits, indicating a broad dimension of Emotional Stability. Subsequently, Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2002) examined 75 studies of the same traits and found an average correlation of .60, with each of the traits also showing moderate to strong correlations with the other Big Five dimensions (i.e., .14 to .33 with Openness and Agreeableness, and .26 to .43 with Conscientiousness and Extraversion).

As in the case of cognitive ability, an integration of broad and narrow traits can be achieved by combining them hierarchically. The most recent development in this regard has been the proposal that a General Factor of Personality (GFP) occupies the apex of the hierarchy in a similar way that  $g$ , the general factor of mental ability, occupies the apex in the organization of cognitive abilities (Museum, 2007; Rushton, Bons, & Hur, 2008). A GFP has now been

extracted from the inter-scale correlations of several sets of the Big Five, the California Psychological Inventory, the Comrey Personality Scales, the Dimensional Assessment of Personality Pathology, the EAS Temperament Scales, the Guilford–Zimmerman Temperament Survey, the HEXACO Personality Inventory, the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory–III, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory–2, the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire, the Personality Assessment Inventory, the Personality Research Form, the Temperament and Character Inventory, and the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Erdle, Irwing, Rushton, & Park, 2010; Museum, 2007; Rushton et al., 2009, 2008; Rushton & Irwing, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d; Schermer & Vernon, 2010; Veselka et al., 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, & Vernon, 2009).

The GFP has been found across diverse samples and procedures. The largest sample consisted of 628,640 Internet respondents who completed the Big Five Inventory (Erdle et al., 2010). One study found the GFP was independent of method variance using a multi-trait–multimethod analysis of self-, teacher-, and parent-ratings of 391 13- to 14-year-olds on the Big Five Questionnaire–Children (Rushton et al., 2009). Several cross-national twin studies have found 50% of the variance on the GFP is attributable to genetic influence and 50% to non-shared environmental influence including 322 pairs of twins from the UK, 575 pairs of 2- to 9-year-old twins from South Korea, 651 pairs of 14- to 30-year-old twins from Japan, and 386 pairs of 18- to 74-year-old Canadian and US twins (Rushton et al., 2008, 2009; Veselka et al., 2009a; Veselka,

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 519 438 7224x225; fax: +1 519 438 3938.  
E-mail address: [serdle@uwo.ca](mailto:serdle@uwo.ca) (S. Erdle).

Schermer, Petrides, & Vernon, 2009). The South Korean twin data showed the GFP had emerged by 2- to 3-years of age (Rushton et al., 2008).

The main alternative interpretation of the GFP is that it is due to artifacts of evaluative bias and scale construction (Ashton, Lee, Goldberg, & de Vries, 2009; Bäckstrom, Bjorklund, & Larsson, 2009). So far, however, the evidence shows that even after controlling for these and other artifacts, much substantive variance remains. Bäckstrom et al. (2009) found that social desirability contributed to higher-order factors above the Big Five, but that they were still recovered after controlling for these effects. Similarly, Erdle, Gosling, and Potter (2009) found higher-order factors were related to self-esteem but controlling for self-esteem left the Big Two intact, as it also did the GFP (Erdle et al., 2010). Schermer and Vernon (2010) found that while the GFP was related to social desirability, it had an independent substantive component.

The explanation we favor for the GFP is that, like *g*, it arose through evolutionary selection for adaptive traits that facilitate performance across a wide range of contexts (Rushton et al., 2008). Consistent with the fast-slow life-history theory dubbed Differential *K* Theory by Rushton (1985), individuals high on the GFP are characterized as altruistic, agreeable, relaxed, conscientious, sociable, and intellectually open, with high levels of well-being, satisfaction with life, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence. Musek (2007) found that high scores on the GFP were related to self-esteem and positive affect and low scores to negative affect. Given a GFP, with a well-defined positive and negative pole (the positive pole being more cooperative and prosocial; the negative pole more antagonistic and inefficient), the question arises as to the relation of the GFP to other measures of temperament and the underlying neurobiology of personality.

The present study extends the research on the GFP by exploring measures of the underlying conceptual nervous system. One possibility, suggested by Rushton et al. (2009), is an adaptation of Gray's (1987) Behavioral Inhibition System–Behavioral Activation System (BIS–BAS) and the fundamental process of approach-avoidance. Based on sensitivity to different kinds of reinforcement, Gray's approach attempts an integration starting at the genes, working up through brain anatomy and physiology, and culminating in learning and experiential outcomes including positive and negative emotionality and motivation. Corr (2008) has outlined many of the findings and implications.

In the original Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (RST), Gray (1971, 1987) postulated three independent biological systems to regulate behavior: a behavioral approach/behavioral activation system (BAS), a behavioral inhibition system (BIS), and a fight/flight system (FFS). BIS is the aversive motivational system that controls the experience of anxiety and negative feelings such as fear, frustration, and sadness, and is sensitive to signals of punishment, nonreward, and novelty. BAS is the behavioral activation system causing movement towards goals and results in feelings such as hope, elation, and happiness. FFS is responsible for organizing behavior in response to unconditioned punishment and is related to the far extremes of negative emotion such as panic and rage. Although Jackson (2009) has recently provided a set of theoretically and empirically derived scales to measure Gray and McNaughton's (2000) revised Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (r-RST; with similar names: r-BAS, r-BIS, and r-FFFS, the latter referring to the fight/flight/freezing system), the most widely used measure of RST remains the BIS–BAS scales of Carver and White (1994).

We are unaware of any previous study that has examined the relationship between the GFP and measures of BIS–BAS. Based on prior theory and research, we predict the GFP will correlate positively with measures of BAS, self-esteem, positive affect, and generalized expectancy of reward, and correlate negatively with

measures of BIS, negative affect, and generalized expectancy of punishment. We also predict the GFP and measures of BIS–BAS, self-esteem, positive and negative affect, and expectancy of reward and punishment, will load on a single factor. To increase confidence in the results, we carry out a replication study one year after the first and (in both studies) we control for social desirability, and examine the results separately for men and women.

## 2. Study 1

### 2.1. Method

One hundred and twenty-eight mainly middle-class Caucasian University student volunteers from introductory psychology classes (78 women, 50 men; median age = 18 years) completed paper-and-pencil measures in a large classroom in November 2008. After reading a letter of information about the study, participants signed an informed consent form if they were willing to take part. They were then given a booklet containing the Big Five Inventory (BFI), the Behavioral Inhibition System–Behavioral Activation System (BIS–BAS) scales, the Generalized Reward and Punishment Expectancy Scales (GRAPES), the Single-Item Self-Esteem (SISE) scale, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), and the Marlowe–Crowne (M–C) social desirability scale. Participants were told they could omit any questions or end their participation at any time. Upon completion of the booklet, participants were given a debriefing form describing the hypotheses.

The GFP was measured using the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999). The BFI is a 44-item self-report measure comprised of short items assessing the Big Five factors (OCEAN: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism). Items are responded to on a 5-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The scales of the BFI are widely used and found to be reliable and valid (John & Srivastava, 1999). Scores for the GFP were calculated by aggregating across the Big Five scales, reverse keying Neuroticism to reflect Emotional Stability. An alpha coefficient of .80 was found for the GFP based on the BFI items.

The BIS–BAS constructs were measured using the 20-item BIS/BAS scales (Carver & White, 1994). Items are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. These scales are widely found to be reliable and valid.

The 30-item Generalized Reward and Punishment Expectancy Scales (GRAPES; Ball & Zuckerman, 1990) measure cognitive constructs related to BIS–BAS. Items on the Generalized Expectancy of Reward (REW) and Generalized Expectancy of Punishment (PUN) scales are rated as “true” or “false”. The scales of the GRAPES have internal consistency reliability.

Self-Esteem was measured by the Single-Item Self-Esteem Scale (SISE; Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001). The item “I see myself as someone who has high self-esteem” was rated on a 5-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The SISE has high test–retest reliability and criterion validity above .80 with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE) scale and shows a similar pattern of validity coefficients as the RSE across 37 constructs.

Positive and negative affect were measured using the 20-item Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Positive and negative affective adjectives are rated on 5-point scales ranging from “very slightly or not at all” to “extremely” based on how one generally feels. The Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) scales of the PANAS have been widely shown to be reliable and valid.

Social desirability was measured using the 33-item Marlowe–Crowne social desirability scale (M–C; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Socially desirable but infrequent behaviors are rated “True” or

"False". The M–C scale has been widely found to be reliable and valid.

## 2.2. Results

Bivariate, partial, and multiple correlation analyses and factor analyses were used to examine the relationships among measures. Although measures had different response formats and numbers of items, correlations are not affected since they are based on standard scores (Ferguson & Takane, 1989). Analyses were performed using the 17th version of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows (SPSS v.17).

All the tests showed acceptable levels of reliability, commensurate with the work cited in the Methods. Alpha coefficients for the Behavioral Inhibition and Behavioral Activation scales were .71 and .81; for the Generalized Reward and Punishment Expectancy Scales, .54 and .54; for the Positive and Negative Affect scales, .80 and .85; and for the Marlowe–Crowne social desirability scale, .70.

Table 1 shows the bivariate correlations among the measures. The GFP was significantly positively correlated with the Behavioral Activation System (.42), Generalized Expectancy of Reward (.57), Self-Esteem (.45), and Positive Affect (.62), and significantly negatively correlated with the Behavioral Inhibition System (–.27), Generalized Expectancy of Punishment (–.31), and Negative Affect (–.50). A multiple correlation analysis predicting the GFP from all the measures yielded a significant value of .78 (adjusted R square = .59).

Table 2 shows the results of principal components factor analyses of correlations among all measures (except sex and social desirability). A single factor was extracted accounting for 42% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.38). The GFP, Behavioral Activation, Expectancy of Reward, Positive Affect, and Self-Esteem loaded positively on the factor, whereas Behavioral Inhibition, Expectancy of Punishment, and Negative Affect loaded negatively.

Since the GFP was correlated significantly with Social Desirability, partial correlations were subsequently calculated among all measures with Social Desirability controlled (Table 1). The pattern of correlations remained intact, indicating that the correlates of the GFP are not artifacts of social desirability. Also a principal components factor analysis was carried out on the partial correlations (except sex) after controlling for Social Desirability. The results showed that a single factor accounted for 39% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.30). Thus, the direction of the loadings on the factor was not due to social desirability (Table 2).

As shown in Table 2, the correlations cross-replicated in the men and women. Point-biserial correlations were conducted to test for sex differences on the GFP and its correlates (Table 1). Men scored significantly higher than women on the GFP (.28;  $p < .05$ ). Partial correlations were calculated among all measures

**Table 2**

Factor loadings for Study 1 on the single factor extracted from principal components factor analyses of bivariate correlations and partial correlations controlling sex and social desirability, and bivariate correlations between the GFP and other measures for women and men, in Study 1.

|     | Factor 1<br>Bivariate | Factor 1<br>Sex<br>controlled | Factor 1<br>Desirability<br>controlled | GFP<br>Women | GFP<br>Men |
|-----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| GFP | .85                   | .84                           | .84                                    | 1.00         | 1.00       |
| BAS | .45                   | .50                           | .54                                    | .54**        | .29*       |
| REW | .71                   | .66                           | .70                                    | .62**        | .36*       |
| SE  | .66                   | .62                           | .67                                    | .46**        | .36*       |
| PA  | .69                   | .67                           | .68                                    | .58**        | .59**      |
| BIS | –.54                  | –.44                          | –.47                                   | –.20*        | –.17       |
| PUN | –.53                  | –.52                          | –.48                                   | –.23*        | –.41*      |
| NA  | –.70                  | –.66                          | –.67                                   | –.40**       | –.61**     |

Note: GFP = General Factor of Personality, BAS = Behavioral Activation System, BIS = Behavioral Inhibition System, REW = Generalized Expectancy of Reward, PUN = Generalized Expectancy of Punishment, SE = Self-Esteem, PA = Positive Affect, NA = Negative Affect, and SD = Social Desirability.

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .001$ .

with sex controlled. Principal components factor analyses of partial correlations among all measures (except social desirability) showed a single factor accounted for 39% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.13). The GFP, Behavioral Activation, Expectancy of Reward, Positive Affect, and Self-Esteem loaded positively on the factor, whereas Behavioral Inhibition, Expectancy of Punishment, and Negative Affect loaded negatively (Table 2).

## 3. Study 2

### 3.1. Method

Eighty-eight mainly middle-class Caucasian university student volunteers from introductory psychology classes (54 women, 34 men; median age = 18 years) completed, in November 2009, the same paper- and pencil-measures described in Study 1.

### 3.2. Results

The Alpha coefficients were very similar to those found in Study 1: for the Behavioral Inhibition and Behavioral Activation scales, .76 and .80; for the Generalized Reward and Punishment Expectancy Scales, .63 and .59; for the Positive and Negative Affect scales, .79 and .74; and for the Marlowe–Crowne social desirability scale, .69.

Table 3 shows the bivariate correlations among all the measures. The GFP correlated significantly positively with the Behav-

**Table 1**

Bivariate correlations among all measures for Study 1 (above diagonal) and Partial Correlations with Social Desirability Controlled (below diagonal).

|     | GFP    | BAS   | BIS    | REW    | PUN    | SE     | PA    | NA     | Sex    | SD     |
|-----|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| GFP | 1.00   | .42** | –.27** | .57**  | –.31** | .45**  | .62** | –.50** | –.28** | .30**  |
| BAS | .48**  | 1.00  | .05    | .35**  | –.10   | .18*   | .31** | –.12   | –.01   | –.15   |
| BIS | –.21*  | .03   | 1.00   | –.21*  | .47**  | –.22*  | –.14  | .52**  | .38**  | –.19*  |
| REW | .56**  | .36** | –.17*  | 1.00   | –.26** | .36**  | .44** | –.33** | –.37** | .14    |
| PUN | –.24*  | –.18* | .43**  | –.24*  | 1.00   | –.09   | –.16* | .45**  | .16*   | –.33** |
| SE  | .51**  | .24*  | –.25*  | .39**  | –.08   | 1.00   | .47** | –.35** | –.27** | .04    |
| PA  | .61**  | .34*  | –.14   | .42**  | –.13   | .45**  | 1.00  | –.26*  | –.25** | .18*   |
| NA  | –.47** | –.15  | .52**  | –.31** | .43**  | –.36** | –.22* | 1.00   | .32**  | –.16*  |
| Sex | –.25*  | –.02  | .32**  | –.36** | .13    | –.28** | –.25* | .29**  | 1.00   | –.11   |

Note: GFP = General Factor of Personality, BAS = Behavioral Activation System, BIS = Behavioral Inhibition System, REW = Generalized Expectancy of Reward, PUN = Generalized Expectancy of Punishment, SE = Self-Esteem, PA = Positive Affect, NA = Negative Affect, and SD = Social Desirability.

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Table 3**

Bivariate correlations among all measures for Study 2 (above diagonal) and Partial Correlations with Social Desirability Controlled (below diagonal).

|     | GFP    | BAS   | BIS   | REW   | PUN   | SE    | PA    | NA     | Sex   | SD    |
|-----|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| GFP | 1.00   | .34*  | -.30* | .56** | -.14  | .33*  | .49** | -.63** | -.12  | .31*  |
| BAS | .32*   | 1.00  | -.08  | .50** | -.15  | .54** | .50** | -.09   | -.02  | .17   |
| BIS | -.28*  | -.03  | 1.00  | -.33* | .42** | -.33* | -.17  | .35**  | .33*  | -.07  |
| REW | .51**  | .50** | -.29* | 1.00  | -.32* | .44** | .49** | -.37** | -.22* | .33*  |
| PUN | -.05   | -.11  | .42** | -.26* | 1.00  | -.24* | -.06  | .24*   | .35** | -.12  |
| SE  | .34*   | .56** | -.28* | .44** | -.25* | 1.00  | .41** | -.16   | -.15  | .15   |
| PA  | .47**  | .56** | -.15  | .45** | -.03  | .41** | 1.00  | -.28*  | -.28* | .22*  |
| NA  | -.62** | -.07  | .37*  | -.31* | .21*  | -.11  | -.23* | 1.00   | .15   | -.25* |
| Sex | -.08   | -.04  | .33*  | -.18  | .34*  | -.12  | -.21* | .16    | 1.00  | -.05  |

Note: GFP = General Factor of Personality, BAS = Behavioral Activation System, BIS = Behavioral Inhibition System, REW = Generalized Expectancy of Reward, PUN = Generalized Expectancy of Punishment, SE = Self-Esteem, PA = Positive Affect, NA = Negative Affect, and SD = Social Desirability.

\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .001$ .

ioral Activation System (.34), Generalized Expectancy of Reward (.56), Self-Esteem (.33), and Positive Affect (.49), and significantly negatively with the Behavioral Inhibition System (–.30), Generalized Expectancy of Punishment (–.14, *ns*), and Negative Affect (–.63). A multiple correlation analysis predicting the GFP from all the measures yielded a significant value of .77 (adjusted  $R$  square = .56).

Table 4 shows the results of principal components factor analyses of correlations among all measures (except sex and social desirability). A single factor was extracted that accounted for 42% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.37). The GFP, Behavioral Activation, Expectancy of Reward, Positive Affect, and Self-Esteem loaded positively on the factor, whereas Behavioral Inhibition, Expectancy of Punishment, and Negative Affect loaded negatively.

Since the GFP correlated with Social Desirability, partial correlations were calculated among all measures with Social Desirability controlled (Table 3). The pattern of correlations remained intact, indicating that the correlates of the GFP are not artifacts of social desirability. Also a principal components factor analysis was carried out on the partial correlations among all measures (except sex) after controlling for Social Desirability. The results showed that a single factor accounted for 31% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 2.45). Thus, the direction of the loadings on the factor is not due to social desirability (Table 4).

As shown in Table 4, the correlations cross-replicated in men and women. Point-biserial correlations were conducted to test for sex differences on the GFP and its correlates (Table 3). Men

did not score significantly higher than women on the GFP in Study 2 (.12; *ns*) as they did in Study 1 (.28;  $p < .05$ ). Partial correlations were calculated among all measures with sex controlled. Principal components factor analyses of partial correlations among all measures (except social desirability) showed a single factor accounted for 41% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.24). The GFP, Behavioral Activation, Expectancy of Reward, Positive Affect, and Self-Esteem loaded positively on the factor, whereas Behavioral Inhibition, Expectancy of Punishment, and Negative Affect loaded negatively (Table 4).

#### 4. Discussion

In two studies conducted 12 months apart, the General Factor of Personality (GFP) was found to correlate with measures of the Behavioral Inhibition System–Behavioral Activation System (BIS–BAS), the Generalized Reward and Punishment Expectancy Scales, Self-Esteem, and Positive and Negative Affect. Those who are high on the GFP are high on the Behavioral Activation System, Generalized Expectancy of Reward, Self-Esteem, and Positive Affect and low on the Behavioral Inhibition System, Generalized Expectancy of Punishment, and Negative Affect. Together, these measures accounted for 59% (Study 1) and 56% (Study 2) of the variance in the GFP. In both studies, correlations were unaffected when Social Desirability was statistically controlled, indicating they are not artifacts of social desirability. Both studies found the results cross-replicated for men and women. The finding that the single factor remained intact across two separate studies, with both social desirability and sex controlled, indicates that the GFP and its relation to BIS–BAS is robust and not simply an artifact of social desirability response set.

Finding that the GFP is related to measures of the Behavioral Inhibition and Behavioral Activation Systems may shed light on the neurobiology of personality and the fundamental process of approach-avoidance. As far as we are aware, the two studies reported here are the first to indicate a link between all these affective measures and the GFP. Those high on the GFP are high in behavioral activation and low on behavioral inhibition. Moreover, the GFP is related to measures of self-esteem and positive and negative affect, thereby confirming a previous finding by Muek (2007). Future research on the neurobiological basis of the GFP from a BIS–BAS perspective seems called for.

The biggest limitations of the present report are the small sample sizes ( $N$ s = 128, 88) and the use of only university students. Nonetheless, the results were cross-validated in the two studies both before and after controlling for social desirability and in both men and women. These initial results are encouraging and should lead to further replications and extensions.

**Table 4**

Factor loadings for Study 2 on the single factor extracted from principal components factor analyses of bivariate correlations and partial correlations controlling sex and social desirability, and bivariate correlations between the GFP and other measures for women and men, in Study 2.

|     | Factor 1<br>Bivariate | Factor 1<br>Sex<br>controlled | Factor 1<br>Desirability<br>controlled | GFP<br>Women | GFP<br>Men |
|-----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| GFP | .76                   | .77                           | .75                                    | 1.00         | 1.00       |
| BAS | .67                   | .69                           | .66                                    | .40*         | .26        |
| REW | .80                   | .79                           | .77                                    | .56**        | .56*       |
| SE  | .66                   | .66                           | .68                                    | .37*         | .23*       |
| PA  | .72                   | .71                           | .70                                    | .56**        | .31*       |
| BIS | -.51                  | -.45                          | -.50                                   | -.30*        | -.22       |
| PUN | -.37                  | -.29                          | -.37                                   | -.14         | -.03       |
| NA  | -.59                  | -.57                          | -.57                                   | -.68**       | -.52*      |

Note: GFP = General Factor of Personality, BAS = Behavioral Activation System, BIS = Behavioral Inhibition System, REW = Generalized Expectancy of Reward, PUN = Generalized Expectancy of Punishment, SE = Self-Esteem, PA = Positive Affect, NA = Negative Affect, and SD = Social Desirability.

\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .001$ .

The debate between focusing on higher-order versus lower-order correlated constructs is long-running. Just as some have claimed that positive and negative affect reflects one common dimension from happy to sad (Russell & Carroll, 1999), others have argued that it is better to consider happy and sad as separate dimensions (Rafaeli & Revelle, 2006). In regard to the revised Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (r-RST) and the future of BIS–BAS scales, although Corr (2008) suggested that systems within r-RST functionally interact, Jackson (2009) maintains this does not alter their anatomical conceptual independence or the need for an orthogonal or near orthogonal measurement solution. From the present vantage point, we find ourselves mainly on the side of the “lumpers” rather than the “splitters”, but obviously the last word has not been spoken.

The explanation we favor for the findings is that the GFP, BIS–BAS, generalized expectancies of reward and punishment, self-esteem, and positive and negative affect are a set of co-coordinated characteristics that have arisen jointly through natural selection for adaptive personality traits (Rushton et al., 2008), enhanced by social learning of socially desirable behavior. Another interpretation is that the GFP and its relationship with BIS–BAS, generalized expectancies of reward and punishment, self-esteem, and positive and negative affect arise as an artifact of methods of scale construction and evaluative bias (Ashton et al., 2009; Bäckstrom et al., 2009). Only further research will determine which of these (and other) hypotheses is correct.

## References

- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Goldberg, L. R., & de Vries, R. E. (2009). Higher-order factors of personality: Do they exist? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 79–91.
- Bäckstrom, M., Bjorklund, F., & Larsson, M. R. (2009). Five-factor inventories have a major general factor related to social desirability which can be reduced by framing items neutrally. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 335–344.
- Ball, S. A., & Zuckerman, M. (1990). Sensation seeking, Eysenck's personality dimensions and reinforcement sensitivity in concept formation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 343–353.
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 319–333.
- Corr, P. J. (Ed.). (2008). *The reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Erdle, S., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2009). Does self-esteem account for the higher-order factors of the Big Five? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 921–923.
- Erdle, S., Irwing, P., Rushton, J. P., & Park, J. (2010). The general factor of personality and its relation to self-esteem in 628,640 Internet respondents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 343–346.
- Ferguson, G. A., & Takane, Y. (1989). *Statistical analysis in psychology and education* (6th ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Gray, J. A. (1971). *The psychology of fear and stress*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Gray, J. A. (1987). *The psychology of fear and stress* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, C. J. (2009). Jackson-5 scales of revised Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (r-RST) and their application to dysfunctional real world outcomes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 556–569.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 167–187.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 693–710.
- Musek, J. (2007). A general factor of personality: Evidence for the Big One in the five-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 1213–1233.
- Rafaeli, E., & Revelle, W. (2006). A premature consensus: Are happiness and sadness truly opposite affects? *Motivation and Emotion*, 30, 1–12.
- Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 151–161.
- Rushton, J. P. (1985). Differential K theory: The sociobiology of individual and group differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 441–452.
- Rushton, J. P., Bons, T. A., Ando, J., Hur, Y.-M., Irwing, P., Vernon, P. A., et al. (2009). A general factor of personality from multitrait–multimethod data and cross-national twins. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 12, 356–365.
- Rushton, J. P., Bons, T. A., & Hur, Y.-M. (2008). The genetics and evolution of a general factor of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1173–1185.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2008). A general factor of personality (GFP) from two meta-analyses of the Big Five: Digman (1997) and Mount, Barrick, Scullen, and Rounds (2005). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 679–683.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2009a). A general factor of personality (GFP) from the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 571–576.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2009b). A general factor of personality in 16 sets of the Big Five, the Guilford–Zimmerman Temperament Survey, the California Psychological Inventory, and the Temperament and Character Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 558–564.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2009c). A general factor of personality in the Comrey Personality Scales, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2, and the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 437–442.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2009d). A General Factor of Personality in the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III, the Dimensional Assessment of Personality Pathology, and the Personality Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 1091–1095.
- Russell, J. A., & Carroll, J. M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 3–30.
- Schermer, J. A., & Vernon, P. A. (2010). The correlation between general intelligence (g), a general factor of personality (GFP), and social desirability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 187–189.
- Veselka, L., Schermer, J. A., Petrides, K. V., Cherkas, L. F., Spence, T. D., & Vernon, P. A. (2009). A general factor of personality: Evidence from the HEXACO Model and a measure of trait emotional intelligence. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 12, 420–424.
- Veselka, L., Schermer, J. A., Petrides, K. V., & Vernon, P. A. (2009). Evidence for a heritable general factor of personality in two studies. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 12, 254–260.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect. The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070.