心 理 学 报 2004 ,36(4) :491～499
Acta Psychologica Sinica

What is "Chinese" Personality ?*

Subgroup Differences in the Chinese PersonalityAssessment Inventory (CPAI-2)

Fanny M. Cheung , Shu-fai Cheung
(Department of Psychology , the Chinese University of Hong Kong , Hong Kong , China)

Zhang Jianxin
(Institute of Psychology , Chinese Academy of Sciences , Beijing 100101 , China)

Abstract The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI) is an indigenously developed personality measure , which covers both universal and culture-specific personality dimensions. We argue that a combined emic-etic approach reflects the broader psychological reality and is a useful approach to advance our understanding of psychology cross-culturally. We examine subgroup differences in the CPAI-2 normative sample to illustrate variations and continuity of personality characteristics within the same culture. Sex and age differences on mean scores of the CPAI-2 scales are consistent with expected variations associated socialization and developmental stages. There is no consistent pattern of variations across Hong Kong and different geographical regions within Mainland China. Within-culture and cross-cultural differences illustrate the continuity of individual differences in personality , and the dialectics of emic and etic constructs.

Key words Chinese personality , CPAI , Group differences.

1 Introduction

The indigenization movement in psychology has led to explorations of dimensions of behavior that are unique to the local culture. Kuo-shu Yang[1] pioneered the Chinese indigenization movement in psychology with a focus on traditionalism-modernity and social orientation. Since the 1980s , Chinese psychologists have identified a number of indigenous constructs that illustrate the importance of interpersonal relationships in the study of Chinese personality and social behavior , including harmony , face , and renqing [2～4]. These constructs offer a meaningful taxonomy to describe and explain social behavior in the Chinese cultural context. The fact that they are identified in studies of indigenous Chinese personality does not preclude the possibility that these constructs may also be useful in other cultures , though they have not been covered in mainstream psychology.

In mainstream psychology , the dominant theories of personality have taken on a global application. Many Western personality measures have been translated and applied in other countries to demonstrate the cross-cultural validity of these personality constructs and measures[5]. The importation of Western theories and measures represents the imposed etic approach in which Western constructs are imposed on the local culture and assumed to be universally relevant[6]. The rise of indigenous psychology challenges the presumption of the universality and sufficiency of imposed etics[7].

The development of indigenous theories and measures has led to an important question in studies of personality : the universality vs. uniqueness of personality[8]. This question , however , does not require an either-or answer. There are important common domains in personality across cultures as well as culture-specific dimensions that reflect more adequately the local realities. As such , the indigenization movement is not an end in itself , but a means to expand the horizon of psychology. The goal is not just to study the unique or "true" characteristics of a specific cultural group ; the emic constructs enrich our under-

收稿日期:2004 - 04 - 28
* This project was partially supported by the Hong Kong Government Research Grants Council Earmarked Grant Project CUHK4333/00H.
Corresponding author : Fanny M. Cheung , E-mail : fmcheung @cuhk. edu. hk

standing of universal human behaviors that occur in various cultural contexts. Emics and etics are thus dialectical, and a combined approach is more fruitful in advancing our understanding of psychology cross-culturally.

The Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI)[9] was developed in a combined emic-etic approach to provide a comprehensive measure of personality for the Chinese people. The personality construct included in the CPAI were derived from groups of personality adjectives or person-description reflecting daily life experiences through review of contemporary Chinese literature, review of findings of existing psychological research on Chinese personality, informal interviews and surveys. By exploring folk concepts of person descriptions, we identified constructs that are comparable to other universal personality factors as well as those that have not been included in "universal" factors in the West.

We compared the factor structure obtained on the CPAI jointly with other imported personality measures among Chinese respondents[7] and identified both common and culture-specific personality factors. We also compared the factor structure of the CPAI in other cultural groups, including Asian American and Caucasian American respondents[10]. At this level of factor structure, we are comparing across cultural groups, primarily based on ethnicity. Adopting the same imposed etic approach to confirm the universality of the Five Factor Model, we were able to demonstrate that the factor structure of the CPAI could also be retrieved, and thus could be considered cross-culturally relevant in other cultural groups[10]. This led to the re-naming of the CPAI as Cross-cultural Personality Assessment Inventory. As such, the emic constructs are not necessarily confined to the specific culture, though they are indigenously derived.

The original purpose of personality assessment was to measure individual differences relative to the norm. What constitutes the norm is contextualized. In studies of cross-cultural psychology, ethnicity, such as Chinese and American, is most often used as the basis for comparison. In psychological assessment, cross-cultural differences in norms are just becoming recognized. Cross-cultural differences in the norms may be an important source of bias and misinterpretation when using imported assessment tools. For example, the average normal Chinese adult scores higher than the American normative sample on a number of clinical scales on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory[11]. Without recognizing the cultural differences in norms, there is a risk of overestimating psychopathology in individual assessment.

Culture or ethnicity is a salient contextual variable in understanding group differences. Notwithstanding these cultural differences, commonalities across cultures are consistent. With the wane of differential psychology, there has been little discussion on individual differences based on salient demographic characteristics within the same ethnic group. However, group differences are consistently observed based on a number of demographic variables. For example, gender is one of the most salient contributors to group differences in personality. Separate gender norms are developed for some personality tests used in clinical assessment. Age differences are more pertinent in developmental attributes, such that different age norms are used in cognitive assessment of children. While it may not be necessary, or even appropriate, to derive sub-group norms for the purpose of individual assessment, the interpretation of assessment results would benefit from contextualizing these results along these demographic variables.

This article summarizes the subgroup comparisons in the normative sample obtained in the standardization of the CPAI-2. We highlight the significant differences as a way of illustrating the individual differences in personality within a larger cultural group. At the personality structure level, there is congruence in the factor structure of the CPAI-2 across sex and regions, or even across cultures. However, at the individual scale level, there are significant differences in the mean scores of some scales across groups. We include three basic demographic variables in our analyses: sex, age and region.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

The CPAI-2 standardization sample consists of 1,911 valid protocols collected from six main regions in Mainland China and from Hong Kong in 2001. Due to the large population sizes of the six regions in Mainland China, random sampling of households was infeasible. Therefore, quota sampling was used to match the demographic characteristics of the regions. The demographic characteristics of the six regions, including distribution of age groups, gender, and education level, were identified. Convenience sampling

was used recruit respondents based on the demographic distribution. In Hong Kong, we selected the normative sample using random sampling of households and then the individual adult participant from the household using a Kirsh Grid method. The minimum educational level was primary six to ensure the reading ability required of paper-and-pencil tests. We screened out invalid samples by the following criteria: 1) cases younger than 18 or older than 70; 2) if 10 percent or more of the 600 items were not answered; 3) cases with peculiar response patterns; 4) cases who scored 12 or higher on the Infrequency Scale, or scored 3 or lower on the Response Consistency Index, which were two of the original validity scales of the CPAI described below.

Table 1 presents the number of participants by sex, age group and region.

Table 1　Frequency counts by sex, age group, and region

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	913	47.8
Female	965	50.5
Not Reported	33	1.7
Total	1911	
Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
18～25	362	18.9
26～35	533	27.9
36～45	464	24.3
46～55	345	18.1
56～70	186	9.7
Unknown	21	1.1
Total	1911	
Region	Frequency	Percentage
Hong Kong	336	17.6
North China	252	13.2
Northeast China	206	10.8
East China	500	26.2
Central South China	339	17.7
Southwest China	175	9.2
Northwest China	103	5.4
Total	1911	

2.2　Instrument

The CPAI-2 consists of 3 validity scales, 28 personality scales, and 12 clinical scales. Several changes to the original CPAI were made in the CPAI-2 (see Cheung, et al.[9] for the description of the development of the CPAI). The Inferiority vs. Self-Acceptance scale was listed both as a personality scale and a clinical scale because its relevance for clinical assessment as well as in studying self-esteem in the normal population. In the full CPAI-2, the scale items were presented only once. Six new scales related to openness were added to the original 22 personality scales. The name or direction of some of the original personality scales was altered. The number of items on the personality scales was reduced to accommodate the increase in the number of scales. The number of items on the clinical scales was increased to expand the coverage of psychopathology.

Factor analysis of the CPAI-2 extracted four personality factors and two clinical factors, similar to those of the original CPAI. Even with the addition of the new openness scales, a separate openness factor was not identified. Instead, four of the openness scales (Novelty, Diversity, Divergent Thinking, and Aesthetics) merged with the existing Extraversion vs. Introversion, Leadership, and Enterprise scales to form the Social Potency factor.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the individual scales on the CPAI-2 ranged from 0.47 to 0.85 with a mean of 0.67. Test-retest reliability of the scales at one-week interval among a group of 45 participants was ranged from 0.68 to 0.94, with a mean of 0.84.

2.3　Analyses

The raw scores of each scale were converted to standardized T scores based on the total normative sample, with a score of 50 as the mean and 10 as one standard deviation. We examined subgroup differences using Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) followed by Scheffe post hoc comparison.

3　Results

3.1　MANOVA Results

We conducted two 3-way 2 (sex)-by-5 (age group)-by-7 (region) MANOVA tests, one for the personality scale scores, and the other for the clinical scales. Sex, age group, and region were the fixed factors of the MANOVA. For both personality and clinical scales, all the interaction effects were not significant ($p > 0.01$), while all three main effects were significant ($p < 0.001$). We further examine the specific comparisons between groups on the individual scales based on one-way ANOVA, t-test, and the Scheffe post hoc comparison results as appropri-

ate.

3.1.1 Sex Differences Tables 2 and 3 present the mean T scores of male and female participants on the CPAI-2 personality scales and the validity and clinical scales respectively. Consistent with sex differences found in other personality tests, males scored significantly higher on most of the scales in the Social Potency factor, including Novelty, Diversity, Divergent Thinking, Leadership, Logical vs. Affective Orientation, and Enterprise. They also scored higher on the Optimism vs. Pessimism and Internal vs. External Locus of Control scales in the Dependency factor.

Table 2 Personality scale T-score means for each sex

scale	Sex	
	Male	Female
Novelty	51.4	48.7
Diversity	51.0	49.0
Divergent Thinking	50.7	49.4
Leadership	51.2	48.9
Logical vs Affective Orientation	51.4	48.7
Aesthetics	50.0	50.0
Extraversion vs Introversion	50.0	50.0
Enterprise	52.0	48.1
Responsibility	50.5	49.6
Emotionality ***	48.9	51.0
Inferiority vs Self-Acceptance ***	48.9	50.9
Practical Mindedness	50.6	49.5
Optimism vs Pessimism ***	52.2	48.0
Meticulousness	50.3	49.7
Face ***	49.0	50.8
Internal vs External Locus of Control ***	50.9	49.2
Family Orientation	50.0	50.1
Defensiveness (Ah-Q Mentality)	50.2	49.7
Graciousness vs Meanness	50.1	50.0
Interpersonal Tolerance	50.7	49.5
Self vs. Social Orientation	50.3	49.7
Veraciousness vs Slickness ***	49.1	50.9
Traditionalism vs. Modernity	49.7	50.2
Ren Qing (Relationship Orientation)	49.7	50.2
Social Sensitivity ***	49.0	50.8
Discipline	49.9	50.1
Harmony **	49.4	50.6
Thrift vs Extravagance	49.8	50.2

: ** $p < 0.01$; : *** $p < 0.001$.

Females scored higher on the Emotionality, Inferiority vs. Self-confidence, and Face scales in the Dependability factor. They also scored higher on the Veraciousness vs. Slickness scale in the Accommodation factor, and the Social Sensitivity and Harmony scales in the Interpersonal Relatedness factor.

In addition to the Inferiority scale, which is listed both as a personality and a clinical scale, females scored significantly higher on most of the clinical scales in the Emotional Problem factor, including Anxiety, Depression, Physical Symptoms, and Somatization. On the other hand, males scored higher on Pathological Dependence, Hypomania, and Antisocial Behavior.

There is no sex difference on the scores of the validity scales.

Table 3 Clinical and validity scale T-score means for each sex

scale	Sex	
	Male	Female
Clinical Scales		
Inferiority vs. Self - Acceptance ***	48.9	50.9
Anxiety ***	49.2	50.8
Depression **	49.1	50.8
Physical Symptoms ***	49.2	50.8
Somatization **	49.0	50.8
Sexual Maladjustment ***	50.1	49.8
Pathological Dependence	53.5	46.6
Hypomania ***	50.9	49.1
Antisocial Behavior ***	51.2	48.8
Need For Attention ***	49.6	50.3
Distortion of Reality	49.9	50.1
Paranoia	49.9	50.1
Validity Scales		
Infrequency Scale	50.1	49.9
Good Impression Scale	50.3	49.6
Response Consistency Index	50.2	49.8

3.1.2 Age Differences We divided the respondents into five age groups: 18～25, 26～35, 36～45, 46～55, and 56～70. Tables 4 and 5 present the mean scores of the five age groups on the personality scales, and the clinical and validity scales respectively. Where MANOVA showed significant differences, paired t-tests Scheffe post hoc tests were conducted to identify the groups that differed significantly from one another. We only report those comparisons where Scheffe post hoc comparisons showed significant differences.

On most of the personality scales, there are significant age differences. The oldest age group scored

lowest on most of the Social Potency factor scales, including Novelty, Diversity, Divergent Thinking, and Aesthetics. This group also scored highest on many of the Responsibility factor and Interpersonal Relatedness factor scales. Conversely, the youngest age group scored highest on the same Social Potency factor scales, and lowest on the Responsibility factor and Interpersonal Relatedness factor scales. The middle-age groups scored in between on these scales.

Table 4　Personality scale T-score means for each age group

scale	Age (years old)				
	18～25	26～35	36～45	46～55	56～70
Novelty ***	53.1[a]	51.1[a,b]	49.2[b,c]	48.3[c,d]	46.3[d]
Diversity ***	54.8[a]	51.0[b]	48.8[b,c]	47.3[c,d]	45.6[d]
Divergent Thinking ***	52.0[a]	50.5[a,b]	49.5[b]	48.6[b]	48.6[b]
Leadership **	51.2[a]	50.4[a]	49.6[a,b]	49.9[a,b]	48.0[b]
Logical vs Affective Orientation	50.8	50.7	49.5	48.9	49.9
Aesthetics ***	52.9[a]	50.6[b]	49.1[c,d]	48.6[c,d]	47.1[d]
Extraversion vs Introversion	51.1	49.6	49.7	50.5	48.6
Enterprise	50.7	50.3	49.5	50.2	48.9
Responsibility ***	45.9[a]	49.0[b]	50.9[b,c]	52.2[c]	54.7[d]
Emotionality ***	53.6[a]	50.9[b]	49.3[b,c]	48.0[c]	45.6[d]
Inferiority vs Self-Acceptance	51.4	50.1	49.6	49.4	48.8
Practical Mindedness ***	46.2[a]	48.5[a]	50.9[b]	52.7[b,c]	54.8[c]
Optimism vs Pessimism ***	48.7[a]	49.5[a]	50.3[a,b]	50.6[a,b]	52.3[b]
Meticulousness ***	46.8[a]	49.2[b]	51.4[b,c]	51.4[b,c]	52.4[c]
Face ***	52.9[a]	51.2[a,b]	49.0[b,c]	48.3[c,d]	46.3[d]
Internal vs External Locus of Control	50.9	49.4	50.0	49.7	51.2
Family Orientation ***	47.5[a]	48.9[a,b]	51.0[b]	51.1[b]	53.7[c]
Defensiveness (Ah - Q Mentality)	50.3	50.1	50.2	50.3	47.8
Graciousness vs Meanness	49.1	49.7	49.9	50.4	51.9
Interpersonal Tolerance ***	51.8[a]	50.4[a,b]	49.7[a,b]	48.5[b]	48.8[b]
Self vs. Social Orientation	50.8	50.3	49.9	49.3	49.4
Veraciousness vs Slickness ***	47.0[a]	48.4[a]	51.2[b]	52.2[b,c]	53.7[c]
Traditionalism vs. Modernity ***	46.7[a]	48.2[a]	51.0[b]	53.3[b]	53.2[b]
Ren Qing (Relationship Orientation) **	48.3[a]	50.1[a,b]	49.9[a,b]	51.2[b]	50.5[a,b]
Social Sensitivity	50.1	49.6	49.7	50.5	50.6
Discipline ***	47.2[a]	48.5[a]	51.1[b]	52.4[b]	52.5[b]
Harmony ***	47.1[a]	49.8[b]	50.9[b]	51.1[b]	51.9[b]
Thrift vs Extravagance ***	47.4[a]	48.0[a,b]	50.1[b]	53.5[c]	54.0[c]

Note: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test age main effect. ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.
[a,b,c,d]: Means of the same letter are not statistically different among themselves.

Table 5　Clinical and validity scale T-score means for each age group

scale	Age (years old)				
	18～25	26～35	36～45	46～55	56～70
Inferiority vs. Self-Acceptance	51.4	50.1	49.6	49.4	48.8
Anxiety **	51.7[a]	49.7[a,b]	49.7[a,b]	49.1[b]	49.9[a,b]
Depression ***	51.7[a]	50.3[a,b]	49.8[a,b]	48.6[b]	48.6[b]
Physical Symptoms **	49.1[a]	49.4[a]	50.1[a,b]	50.8[a,b]	51.8[b]

(Continued)

scale	Age (years old)				
	18～25	26～35	36～45	46～55	56～70
Somatization	48.8	49.9	50.2	50.7	50.7
Sexual Maladjustment **	49.7^{a,b}	48.9 ^{a,b}	50.1^{a,b}	51.0^{a}	51.7^{b}
Pathological Dependence	49.7	50.4	49.6	51.1	48.6
Hypomania ***	54.5^{a}	50.3^{b}	48.4^{b,c}	48.6^{b,c}	47.1^{c}
Antisocial Behavior ***	53.1^{a}	50.1^{b}	49.6^{b}	49.0^{b}	46.4^{c}
Need For Attention ***	53.9^{a}	50.1^{b}	49.2^{b,c}	48.3^{b,c}	47.1^{c}
Distortion of Reality	51.2	49.9	49.4	50.0	49.8
Paranoia ***	51.8^{a}	50.4^{a,b}	49.6^{a,b,c}	49.2^{b,c}	47.8^{c}
Validity Scales	18～25	26～35	36～45	46～55	56～70
Infrequency Scale	50.7	49.4	49.4	50.7	50.7
Good Impression Scale ***	48.5^{a}	48.7^{a}	50.5^{a,b}	51.6^{b}	52.2^{b}
Response Consistency Index	50.8	50.4	49.6	49.5	49.3

Note: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test age main effect. *: $p < 0.01$; **: $p < 0.001$.
a, b, c, d: Means of the same letter are not statistically different among themselves.

Table 6 Personality scale T-score means for each region

scale	Region						
	Hong Kong	North	North-east	East	Central South	South-west	North-west
Novelty **	48.6	50.4	51.2	50.0	49.0	51.8	51.3
Diversity **	50.1^{a,b}	50.1^{a,b}	50.7^{a,b}	50.1^{a,b}	48.2^{a}	52.0^{b}	50.2^{a,b}
Divergent Thinking	49.4	50.0	50.7	50.6	48.5	51.2	50.7
Leadership **	48.0	51.0	50.1	50.3	49.8	51.3	51.1
Logical vs Affective Orientation	49.0	50.1	50.6	50.4	49.1	50.8	51.6
Aesthetics ***	48.9^{a}	49.9^{a,b}	52.7^{b}	50.4^{a,b}	48.5^{a}	50.5^{a,b}	50.6^{a,b}
Extraversion vs Introversion	48.9	51.5	49.9	50.0	49.6	50.6	50.3
Enterprise	48.6	50.4	50.6	49.9	49.5	51.4	51.8
Responsibility	50.0	50.1	50.4	49.4	49.7	50.9	51.6
Emotionality	48.5	49.4	50.5	50.1	51.1	50.6	49.9
Inferiority vs Self-Acceptance	49.4	49.8	50.0	49.9	51.2	49.5	49.5
Practical Mindedness ***	51.9^{b}	51.2^{a,b}	50.4^{a,b}	48.4^{a}	49.7^{a,b}	49.5^{a,b}	49.8^{a,b}
Optimism vs Pessimism	49.7	51.3	49.7	49.8	49.4	50.8	49.9
Meticulousness	50.6	49.6	50.4	49.6	49.6	49.7	51.7
Face ***	48.3	49.4	50.3	51.3	50.6	48.9	49.9
Internal vs External Locus of Control **	50.6	49.9	51.6	48.8	49.2	51.5	51.0
Family Orientation	50.6	50.7	50.3	49.8	49.2	49.2	50.8
Defensiveness (Ah-Q Mentality)	48.5	49.6	50.3	51.0	50.3	49.4	50.7
Graciousness vs Meanness **	51.2	50.8	51.3	49.4	49.1	49.0	49.2
Interpersonal Tolerance ***	53.2^{c}	50.3^{a,b,c}	49.8^{a,b}	49.5^{a,b}	47.3^{a}	49.8^{a,b}	51.0^{b,c}
Self vs. Social Orientation ***	48.0^{a,b}	50.0^{a,b}	51.9^{a}	50.4^{a,b}	49.4^{b}	51.8^{a,b}	49.6^{a,b}
Veraciousness vs Slickness	50.6	51.0	49.5	49.2	50.0	50.2	50.4
Traditionalism vs. Modernity ***	49.5^{a,b}	50.4^{a,b}	48.7^{a}	49.1^{a,b}	52.3^{b}	50.2^{a,b}	49.7^{a,b}
Ren Qing (Relationship Orientation) ***	46.5^{a}	52.4^{b}	49.9^{b}	50.2^{b}	50.9^{b}	50.3^{b}	51.4^{b}
Social Sensitivity **	48.5^{a}	52.0^{b}	50.4^{a,b}	50.2^{a,b}	49.9^{a,b}	49.6^{a,b}	49.7^{a,b}
Discipline	48.5	51.0	49.7	49.8	51.2	49.7	50.7
Harmony	50.4	51.7	49.0	49.6	49.3	50.3	50.2
Thrift vs Extravagance	49.9	50.9	49.9	49.2	50.8	50.0	49.9

Note: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test age main effect. *: $p < 0.01$; **: $p < 0.001$.
a, b, c, d: Means of the same letter are not statistically different among themselves.

On the clinical scales, the youngest age group scored highest on most of the clinical scales, with the exception of Physical Symptoms and Sexual Maladjustment. No age difference was found on Somatization, Pathological Dependence, and Distortion of Reality.

On the validity scales, the older age groups scored higher on the Good Impression Scale.

3.1.3 Regional Differences The normative sample consists of adult respondents recruited from six major geographical regions in Mainland China as well as from Hong Kong. These regions formed the unit of analysis. We did not have sufficient respondents from the rural areas to formulate comparisons between urban and rural subgroups. The geographical regions served as proxy to the relative level of economic development across China. We expect Hong Kong, East China and Central South China to be economically more developed than Southwest and Northwest China. Tables 6 and 7 present the mean T scores of participants from the six major regions in Mainland China and from Hong Kong on the personality scales, and the clinical and validity scales respectively. Where MANOVA showed significant differences, paired t-tests Scheffe post hoc tests were conducted to identify the groups that differed significantly from one another. We only report those comparisons where Scheffe post hoc comparisons showed significant differences, and where meaningful interpretation may be made on the basis of trends of economic development.

Although significant overall differences among the regions were found using MANOVA on some of the personality and clinical scales, significant differences were found among subgroups in the post hoc analyses on seven personality scales and four clinical scales. The pattern of comparisons did not reveal any meaningful interpretation on the basis of regional characteristics or economic development. Despite the differences between the historical and socioeconomic development of Hong Kong and that of other parts of Mainland China, distinct difference on the CPAI scales between Hong Kong and all the other regions was found on only one personality scale and one clinical scale. The Hong Kong normative sample scored lower than all the other Mainland Chinese subgroups on both Renqing and Sexual Maladjustment.

Table 7　Clinical and validity scale T-score means for each region

scale	Region						
	Hong Kong	North	North-east	East	Central South	South-west	North-west
Inferiority vs. Self-Acceptance	49.4	49.8	50.0	49.9	51.2	49.5	49.5
Anxiety	49.6	48.9	49.4	49.9	50.9	51.5	49.8
Depression	49.8	48.4	50.2	49.9	50.3	51.3	51.3
Physical Symptoms	49.8	49.7	51.3	49.7	49.7	50.2	50.5
Somatization	49.5	49.4	50.0	50.5	51.0	49.4	48.5
Sexual Maladjustment ***	46.7^{a}	50.4^{b}	51.4^{b}	50.8^{b}	50.4^{b}	50.6^{b}	50.9^{b}
Pathological Dependence ***	47.2^{a}	$49.8^{a,b}$	$49.4^{a,b}$	51.1^{b}	50.8^{b}	50.9^{b}	51.3^{b}
Hypomania ***	47.7^{a}	$50.2^{a,b}$	$50.5^{a,b}$	$50.9^{a,b}$	$49.9^{a,b}$	$50.6^{a,b}$	51.1^{b}
Antisocial Behavior **	47.9	49.4	50.1	50.5	51.1	51.0	50.7
Need For Attention ***	48.0^{a}	$49.1^{a,b}$	$50.7^{a,b}$	51.4^{b}	$50.4^{a,b}$	$49.9^{a,b}$	$49.5^{a,b}$
Distortion of Reality ***	48.3	49.0	50.3	51.2	49.7	51.3	50.5
Paranoia	49.7	48.5	50.0	50.8	49.9	50.9	50.1
Validity Scales							
Infrequency Scale **	49.6	48.4	51.4	51.0	48.8	51.0	50.0
Good Impression Scale **	49.7	50.3	51.9	50.5	48.5	49.2	50.7
Response Consistency Index	50.5	50.4	50.0	49.8	50.1	50.3	47.8

Note: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test age main effect. *: $p < 0.01$; **: $p < 0.001$.
a, b, c, d: Means of the same letter are not statistically different among themselves.

4 Discussion

Subgroup comparisons on scores of the CPAI-2 scales show that sex and age are related to personality differences. These differences may be attributed to socialization and developmental stages. For example, male respondents tend to score higher on openness-related and leadership-related scales on the Social Potency factor. They tend to be more self-confident and less emotional. In terms of clinical features, males manifest less emotional symptoms but more acting-out behavioral problems. These sex differences are consis-

tent with the stereotypic gender roles ascribed to men and women in Chinese culture. Similar sex differences are found in other personality measures, such as the MMPI. Gender differences are consistently found in personality studies[12, 13]. As such, gender analysis is expected in reports of psychological investigations.

In terms of developmental stages, younger respondents tend to be more open to new ideas and experience, but are more prone to emotional turmoil and behavioral disturbances. With maturation and more life experiences, older respondents are generally more dependable and worldly wise. They tend to maintain closer interpersonal ties and family relationships. Personality changes across the lifespan have also been found in other Western studies, especially with respect to temperamental traits[14].

On the other hand, comparison across major regions of China did not reveal any distinct patterns of differences that may be attributable to geographical or socioeconomic contexts. Although subgroup differences are found, there are not any consistent patterns among specific regions. Instead, the commonalities speak for the cultural continuity of Chinese societies that transcend economic development and sociopolitical history. Even for Hong Kong, which has been a colony under British rule for over a century before its reunification with Mainland China in 1997, the pattern of mean differences from the rest of China is not distinct. The mean scores for Hong Kong are similar to some regions but different from others on various scales without a consistent pattern.

Despite the continuity, we caution against the simplistic generalization about a "Chinese" personality. The CPAI-2 provides a useful framework to describe personality dimensions that are salient in the Chinese cultural context. With the translation of the CPAI-2 into English, Korean and Japanese, we also found congruent personality structures in non-Chinese samples. What have been originally believed to be unique Chinese constructs can also be identified in other cultures.

The ultimate value of the personality taxonomy derived indigenously in a Chinese culture lies in its utility in describing and predicting behavior. The dialectical process of the development of emic and etic constructs illustrates that commonalities may be found by exploring indigenously derived emic constructs cross-culturally. The personality structure identified in the CPAI-2 provides a useful taxonomy for understanding not only Chinese personality, but possibly personality in other collectivistic cultures.

At the level of individual scales, cross-cultural comparisons only allude to modal differences, which vary with other socio-demographic variables such as sex and age. Individual variations along these and other dimensions form the basis for the measurement of personality. Results from the subgroup analyses on the CPAI-2 normative sample show that there are variations in the level of specific personality characteristics within the same culture based on socio-demographic backgrounds. These cultural and socio-demographic dimensions provide the contexts to help us interpret scores on personality measures.

Reference

1 Yang K S. Chinese personality and its change. In: Bond M H ed. the Psychology of the Chinese people. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1986. 106～170

2 Gabrenya W K Jr, Hwang K K. Chinese social interaction: Harmony and hierarchy on the good earth. In: Bond M H ed. the Handbook of Chinese psychology. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1996. 309～321

3 Hwang K K. Face and favor: The Chinese power game. American Journal of Sociology, 1987, 92: 945～974

4 Yang K S. Towards an indigenous Chinese psychology: A selective review of methodological, theoretical, and empirical accomplishments. Chinese Journal of Psychology, 1999, 41: 181～211

5 Cheung F M. Use of Western and indigenously developed personality tests in Asia. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 2004, 53: 173～191

6 Sue S. Ethnic minority issues in psychology: A reexamination. American Psychologist, 1983, 38: 583～592

7 Cheung F M, Leung K, Zhang J X, Sun H F, Gan Y Q, Song, W Z, Xie D. Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the Five Factor Model complete? Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2001, 32: 407～433

8 Sue S, Chang J. The state of psychological assessment in Asia. Psychological Assessment, 2003, 15: 306～310

9 Cheung F M, Leung K, Fan R, Song W Z, Zhang J X, Zhang J P. Development of the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI). Journal of Cross cultural Psychology, 1996, 27: 181～199

10 Cheung F M, Cheung S F, Leung K, Ward C, Leong F. The English version of the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2003, 34: 433～452

11 Cheung F M. Manual of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2) Chinese edition. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2003

12 Cohn L D. Sex differences in the course of personality development: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 1991, 109: 252～

266
13 Feingold A. Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 1994, 116: 429～456
14 Roberts B W, DelVecchio W F. The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies. Psychological Bulletin, 2000, 126: 3～25

什么是“中国人”的个性?

——《中国人个性测量表 CPAI-2》的分组差异

张妙清　张树辉
(香港中文大学心理学系,中国香港)
张建新
(中国科学院心理研究所,北京 100101)

摘　要　《中国人个性测量表 CPAI-2》是一套本土化发展而成的个性量表,涵盖包括中国文化独有以及在大多数文化共有的性格维度。该文认为结合文化特定与文化共通的研究方法能全面地反映心理现实,亦能加深我们对跨文化心理学的理解。该研究分析了 CPAI-2 常模的几个子组别,以展示在同一文化之内,性格特质的差异及连续性。性别及年龄组别间的平均分差异均符合相应的社化过程及人生发展阶段所预期的结果。而中国香港及中国不同地区在平均分的差异上则没有特定的模式。文化内及跨文化的差异展示了个人性格差异的连续性,以及文化特定与文化共通概念的相互关系。

关键词　中国人的个性,中国人个性测量表,分组差异。
分类号　B848