Click Here

0 ratings0% found this document useful (0 votes)18 viewsSaveSave NEO PI R - Hoja de Respuestas For Later0%0% found this document useful, undefined Share copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution You must give appropriate credit , provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made . You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation . No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. Auteur : COSTA P.T. et McCRAE R.R. (Adaptation franaise ROLLAND J.-P.)Utilit : PersonnalitType : PersonnalitAge dapplication : AdultePassation : Individuelle ou collectiveUtilisation : LInventaire de personnalit Rvis NEO (NEO PI-R) permet une mesure des 5 dimensions principales (ou domaines) de personnalit et de quelques-uns des traits (ou facettes) les plus importants qui constituent chaque domaine. Les 5 domaines et les 30 facettes du NEO PI-R fournissent une valuation large de la personnalit adulte. Les 5 domaines sont : Nvrosisme, Extraversion, Ouverture, Agrabilit, Conscience. Il existe 2 versions : la forme S pour lauto-valuation et la forme R pour lvaluation par un observateur. Il est constitu de 240 items 5 choix de rponses. Le NEO PI-R est une mesure des traits de personnalit normale, mesure qui a dmontr sa pertinence la fois en clinique et en recherche. Le matriel du NEO PI-R est constitu dun manuel, dun Cahier de passation et dune Feuille de rponses autoscorables et dune Feuille de profil. Il nest pas limit dans le temps (en moyenne 30 40 minutes).Date : 1989, 1998 (adapt.fr.)Big Five personality trait inventoryThe Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) is a personality inventory that assesses an individual on five dimensions of personality. These are the same dimensions found in the Big Five personality traits. These traits are openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion (-introversion), agreeableness, and neuroticism. In addition, the NEO PI-R also reports on six subcategories of each Big Five personality trait (called facets).Historically, development of the Revised NEO PI-R began in 1978 when Paul Costa and Robert McCrae published a personality inventory.[1] The researchers later published three updated versions of their personality inventory in 1985,[2] 1992,[3] and 2005.[4] These were called the NEO PI (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness Personality Inventory), NEO PI-R (or Revised NEO PI), and NEO PI-3, respectively. The revised inventories feature updated vocabulary that could be understood by adults of any education level, as well as children.The inventories have both longer and shorter versions, with the full NEO PI-R consisting of 240 items and providing detailed facet scores. By contrast, the shorter NEO-FFI (NEO Five-Factor Inventory) comprised 60 items (12 per trait). The test was originally developed for use with adult men and women without overt psychopathology. It has also been found to be valid for use with children.A table of the personality dimensions measured by the NEO PI-R, including facets, is as follows:NeuroticismExtraversionOpenness to experienceAgreeablenessConscientiousnessAnxietyWarmth/Kindness[5]Fantasy/Imagination[5]/Trust (in Others[5])/Competence/Self-efficacy[5]/Hostility/Anger[5]/GregariousnessAesthetics/Artistic Interest[5]/Straightforwardness/Morality[5]/Order(liness)[5]/Organizing[5]DepressionAssertivenessFeelings/Emotionality[5]AltruismDutifulness/Sense of Duty/Obligation[5]Self-consciousnessActivity (Level[5])/Lively Temperament[6] Actions/Adventurousness[5]/Exploration[6]Compliance/Cooperation[5]Achievement StrivingImpulsiveness/Immoderation[5]Excitement SeekingIdeas/Intellectual Interest[5]/Curiosity[6]ModestySelf-Discipline/Willpower[5]Vulnerability to Stress/Fear[5]/Learned helplessness[5]Positive Emotion/Cheerfulness[5]/Vivacity[6]Values/Psychological liberalism[5]/Tolerance to ambiguity[5]Tendermindedness/Sympathy[5]Deliberation/Cautiousness[5]In the most recent publication, there are two forms for the NEO, self-report (form S) and observer-report (form R) versions. Both forms consist of 240 items (descriptions of behavior) answered on a five-point Likert scale. Finally, there is a 60-item inventory, the NEO FFI. There are paper and computer versions of both forms.The manual reports that administration of the full version should take between 30 and 40 minutes. Costa and McCrae reported that an individual should not be evaluated if more than 40 items are missing. They also state that despite the fact that the assessment is "balanced" to control for the effects of acquiescence and nay-saying, that if more than 150 responses, or fewer than 50 responses, are "agree" or "strongly agree", the results should be interpreted with caution.Scores can be reported to most test-takers on "Your NEO Summary", which provides a brief explanation of the assessment, and gives the individuals domain levels and a strengths-based description of three levels (high, medium, and low) in each domain. For example, low N reads "Secure, hardy, and generally relaxed even under stressful conditions," whereas high N reads "Sensitive, emotional, and prone to experience feelings that are upsetting." For profile interpretation, facet and domain scores are reported in T scores and are recorded visually as compared to the appropriate norming group.[2]The internal consistency of the NEO scales was assessed on 1,539 individuals.[7] The internal consistency of the NEO PI-R was high, at: N = .92, E = .89, O = .87, A = .86, C = .90. The internal consistency of the facet scales ranged from .56 to .81. The internal consistency of the NEO PI-3 was consistent with that of the NEO PI-R, with ranging from .89 to .93 for the five domains. Internal consistency coefficient from the facets, with each facet scale comprising fewer items than each of the Big Five scales, were necessarily smaller, ranging from .54 to .83.[7]For the NEO FFI (the 60 item domain only version) the internal consistencies reported in the manual were: N = .79, E = .79, O = .80, A = .75, C = .83. In the literature, the NEO FFI is used more often, with investigators using the NEO PI-R usually using the items from just the domains they are interested in. Sherry et al. (2007) found internal consistencies for the FFI to be as follows: N = .85, E = .80, O = .68, A = .75, C = .83.[8]The NEO has been translated into many languages. The internal consistency coefficients of the domain scores of a translation of the NEO that has been used in the Philippines are satisfactory. The alphas for the domain scores range from .78 to .90,[9] with facet alphas having a median of .61.[10] Observer-ratings NEO PI-R data from 49 cultures was used as criterion in a recent study which tested whether individuals' perceptions of the "national character" of a culture accurately reflected the personality of the members of that culture (it did not).[11]The test-retest reliability of the NEO PI-R has also been found to be satisfactory. The test-retest reliability of an early version of the NEO after 3 months was: N = .87, E = .91, O = .86.[12] The test-retest reliability for over 6 years, as reported in the NEO PI-R manual, was the following: N = .83, E = .82, O = .83, A = .63, C = .79. Costa and McCrae pointed out that these findings not only demonstrate good reliability of the domain scores, but also their stability (among individuals over the age of 30). Scores measured six years apart varied only marginally more than scores measured a few months apart.[3]The psychometric properties of NEO PI-R scales have been found to generalize across ages, cultures, and methods of measurement.[13]Although individual differences (rank-order) tend to be relatively stable in adulthood, there are maturational changes in personality that are common to most people (mean-level changes). Most cross-sectional and longitudinal studies suggest that neuroticism, extraversion, and openness tend to decline, whereas agreeableness and conscientiousness tend to increase during adulthood.[14] A meta-analysis of 92 personality studies that used several different inventories (among them NEO PI-R) found that social dominance, conscientiousness, and emotional stability increased with age, especially in the age span of 20 to 40.[15]Costa and McCrae reported in the NEO manual research findings regarding the convergent and discriminant validity of the inventory. Examples of these findings include the following:For the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Introversion is correlated with the NEO facet Warmth at 0.61, and with the NEO facet Gregariousness at 0.59. Intuition is correlated with the NEO facet Fantasy at 0.43 and with the NEO facet Aesthetics at 0.56. Feeling is correlated with the NEO facet Tender-mindedness at 0.39.For the Self-Directed Search (a personality inventory developed by John L. Holland for careers work), Artistic is correlated with the NEO facet Aesthetic at 0.56, Investigative is correlated with the NEO facet Ideas at 0.43, and Social is correlated with the NEO facet Tender-mindedness at 0.36.A number of studies evaluated the criterion validity of the NEO. For example, Conard (2005) found that Conscientiousness significantly predicted the GPA of college students, over and above using SAT scores alone.[16] In a study conducted in Seville, Spain, Cano-Garcia and his colleagues (2005) found that, using a Spanish version of the inventory, dimensions of the NEO correlated with teacher burnout. Neuroticism was related to the "emotional exhaustion" dimension of burnout, and Agreeableness, with the "personal accomplishment" burnout dimension.[17] Finally, Korukonda (2007) found that Neuroticism was positively related to computer anxiety; Openness and Agreeableness were negatively related to computer anxiety.[18]The NEO-PI-R has been extensively used across cultures. Per the information on the Psychological Assessment Resources (PAR) website (PAR is the publisher of the NEO-PI-R), the NEO-PI-R has been translated into 40 languages. These languages are Afrikaans, Albanian, Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Croatian, Estonian, Filipino, Finnish, Hebrew, Hindi, Hmong, Hungarian, Icelandic, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Kannada, Korean, Latvian, Lithuanian, Malay, Marathi, Persian, Peruvian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovene, Sotho, Spanish, Taiwanese, Thai, Tigrignan, Turkish, Urdu, Vietnamese, and Xhosa.Critical reviews of the NEO PI-R were published in the 12th edition of the Mental Measurements Yearbook (MMY). The NEO-Pi-R (which only measures 57% of the known trait variance in the normal personality sphere alone) has been severely criticized both in terms of its factor analytic/construct validity and its psychometric properties.[19][20] Widiger criticized the NEO for not controlling for social desirability bias.[21] He argued that test developers cannot assume participants will be honest, especially in settings where it benefits people to present themselves in a better light (e.g., forensic or personnel settings). Ben-Porath and Waller pointed out that the NEO Inventories could be improved with the addition of controls for dishonesty and social desirability.[22]Juni, in another review of the NEO PI-R for the MMY, praised the NEO PI-R for including both self- and other-report scales, making it easier for psychologists to corroborate information provided by a client or research participant.[21] Juni criticized the NEO PI-R for its conceptualization using the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality. Juni argued that the existence of the FFM was phenomenological and atheoretical, the model gaining popularity as a result of the influence of the authors (McCrae and Costa) in the psychological community. The NEO PI-R has also been criticized because of its market-oriented, proprietary nature.[23] In response to the expense involved in using proprietary personality inventories such as the NEO, other researchers have contributed to the development of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP); IPIP items and scales are available free of charge.[24]NEO PI-R was also criticised for being possibly too complex to understand for less educated or less intelligent individuals.[25]A shortened version of NEO PI-R has been published. The shortened version is the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). It comprises 60 items and is designed to take 10 to 15 minutes to complete; by contrast, the NEO PI-R takes 45 to 60 minutes to complete. The NEO-FFI was revised in 2004.[26] With the publication of the NEO PI-3 in 2005, a revised version of the NEO-FFI was also published.[7] The revision of the NEO-FFI involved the replacement of 15 of the 60 items. The revised edition is thought to be more suitable for younger individuals.[7] The new version had a stronger factor structure and increased reliability.[7]Public domain inventories that correlate well with NEO PI-R have been published using items from the International Personality Item Pool and are collectively known as the "IPIP-NEO". Lewis Goldberg published a 300-question version of the 30-facet scale in 1999.[27] John Johnson and Maples et al. have developed a few 120-question versions based on IPIP questions.[28][29]Very short (5 items each) IPIP-based analogues to the NEO PI-R scales are also part of the Analog for Multiple Broadband Inventories,[30] an inventory designed to approximate a large number of different personality scales with a minimal number of items.Evidence of the NEO scales' stability in different countries and cultures can be considered evidence of its validity. A great deal of cross-cultural research has been carried out on the Five-Factor Model of Personality. Much of the research has relied on the NEO PI-R and the shorter NEO-FFI. McCrae and Allik (2002)[31] edited a book consisting of papers bearing on cross-cultural research on the FFM. Research from China,[32][33] Estonia, Finland,[34] the Philippines, France,[35] German-speaking countries,[36] India,[37] Portugal,[38] Russia,[39] South Korea,[40] Turkey,[41] Vietnam,[42] and Zimbabwe[43] have shown the FFM to be robust across cultures.Rolland, on the basis of the data from a number of countries, asserted that the neuroticism, openness, and conscientiousness dimensions are cross-culturally valid.[44] Rolland further advanced the view that the extraversion and agreeableness dimensions are more sensitive to cultural context. Age differences in the five-factors of personality across the adult life span are parallel in samples from Germany, Italy, Portugal, Croatia, and South Korea.[45] Data examined from many countries have shown that the age and gender differences in those countries resembled differences found in U.S. samples.[46] An intercultural factor analysis yielded a close approximation to the five-factor model.McCrae, Terracciano et al. (2005) further reported data from 51 cultures. Their study found a cross-cultural equivalency between NEO PI-R five factors and facets.[47]With the recent development of the NEO PI-3, cross-cultural research will likely begin to compare the newer version with the NEO PI-R. Piedmont and Braganza (2015) compared the NEO PI-R to the NEO PI-3 using an adult sample from India.[48] They used an English version of the NEO PI-3 in order to measure its utility in individuals who speak English as a second language. Piedmont and Braganza found that the NEO PI-3 had slightly higher item/total correlations and better test-retest reliability than the NEO PI-R. They suggested that the NEO PI-3 has the potential to be utilized with those who do not speak English as their first language.The NEO PI-R has been used in research pertaining to both (a) genotype and personality and (b) brain and personality. Such studies have not always been conclusive. For example, one study found some evidence for an association between NEO PI-R facets and polymorphism in the tyrosine hydroxylase gene,[49] while another study could not confirm the finding.[50]In a study published in Science, Lesch et al. (1996) found a relationship between the serotonin transporter gene regulatory region (5-HTTLPR) and the neuroticism subscale. Individuals with a shorter allele had higher neuroticism scores than individuals with the longer allele. The effect was significant for heterozygotes and even stronger for people homozygous for the shorter allele. Although the finding is important, this specific gene contributes to only 4% of the phenotypic variation in neuroticism. The authors concluded that "if other genes were hypothesized to contribute similar gene dosage effects to anxiety, approximately 10 to 15 genes might be predicted to be involved."[51]Psychological testingPsychometricsMinnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory16PF QuestionnaireSynthetic Aperture Personality Assessment^ Costa, Paul T.; McCrae, Robert R. (1978). "Objective Personality Assessment". The Clinical Psychology of Aging. Springer US. pp.119143. ISBN978-1-4684-3342-5.^ a b Costa, Paul T.; McCrae, Robert R. (1985). "The NEO personality inventory manual". Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. {{cite journal}}: Cite journal requires |journal= (help)^ a b Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.^ McCrae, Robert R.; Costa, Paul T. Jr.; Martin, Thomas A. (June 2005). "The NEOPI3: A More Readable Revised NEO Personality Inventory". Journal of Personality Assessment. 84 (3): 261270. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8403_05.^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x "Short Form for the IPIP-NEO (International Personality Item Pool Representation of the NEO PI-R)". 26 November 2019.^ a b c d Gosling SD, John OP (1999). "Personality Dimensions in Nonhuman Animals: A Cross-Species Review" (PDF). Current Directions in Psychological Science. 8 (3): 6975. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.00017. S2CID145716504.^ a b c d e McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr., (2010). NEO Inventories: Professional manual. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.^ Sherry, S. B.; Hewitt, P. L.; Flett, G. L.; Lee-Baggley, D. L.; Hall, P. A. (2007). "Trait perfectionism and perfectionistic self-presentation in personality pathology". Personality and Individual Differences. 42 (3): 477490. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.07.026.^ Church, A. T.; Katigbak, M. S. (2002). "Indigenization of psychology in the Philippines". International Journal of Psychology. 37 (3): 129148. doi:10.1080/00207590143000315.^ Katigbak, M. S.; Church, A. T.; Guanzon-Lapea, M. A.; Carlota, A. J.; Del, G. H. (2002). "Are indigenous personality dimensions culture specific? Philippine inventories and the five-factor model". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 82 (1): 89101. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.89. PMID11811638.^ Terracciano, A.; Abdel-Khalek, A. M.; Adm, N.; Adamovov, L.; Ahn, CK; Ahn, HN; Alansari, BM; Alcalay, L; Allik, J; Angleitner, A; Avia, MD; Ayearst, LE; Barbaranelli, C; Beer, A; Borg-Cunen, MA; Bratko, D; Brunner-Sciarra, M; Budzinski, L; Camart, N; Dahourou, D; De Fruyt, F; De Lima, MP; Del Pilar, GE; Diener, E; Falzon, R; Fernando, K; Fickov, E; Fischer, R; Flores-Mendoza, C; Ghayur, MA (2005). "National Character Does Not Reflect Mean Personality Trait Levels in 49 Cultures". Science. 310 (5745): 96100. Bibcode:2005Sci...310...96T. doi:10.1126/science.1117199. PMC2775052. PMID16210536.^ McCrae, R. R.; Costa, P. T. (1983). "Joint factors in self-reports and ratings: Neuroticism, extraversion and openness to experience". Personality and Individual Differences. 4 (3): 245255. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(83)90146-0.^ McCrae R. R.; Kurtz J. E.; Yamagata S.; Terracciano A. (2011). "Internal consistency, retest reliability, and their implications for personality scale validity". Pers Soc Psychol Rev. 15 (1): 2850. doi:10.1177/1088868310366253. PMC2927808. PMID20435807.^ Paul T. Costa, Jr. & Robert R. McCrae (2006). "Age Changes in Personality and Their Origins: Comment on Roberts, Walton, and Viechtbauer (2006)" (PDF). Psychological Bulletin. 132 (1): 2628. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.26. PMID16435955.^ Brent W. Roberts; Kate E. Walton; Wolfgang Viechtbauer (January 2006). "Patterns of Mean-Level Change in Personality Traits Across the Life Course: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies" (PDF). Psychological Bulletin. 132 (1): 125. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1. PMID16435954.^ Conard, M. A. (2006). "Aptitude is not enough: How personality and behavior predict academic performance". Journal of Research in Personality. 40 (3): 339346. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2004.10.003.^ Francisco Javier Cano-Garca, Eva Maria Padilla-Muoz & Miguel ngel Carrasco-Ortiz (2005). "Personality and contextual variables in teacher burnout" (PDF). Personality and Individual Differences. 38 (4): 929940. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.06.018. hdl:11441/56856. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2010-08-21.^ Appa Rao Korukonda (2007). "Differences that do matter: A dialectic analysis of individual characteristics and personality dimensions contributing to computer anxiety". Computers in Human Behavior. 23 (4): 19211942. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2006.02.003.^ Boyle, G.J., Stankov, L., & Cattell, R.B. (1995). Measurement and statistical models in the study of personality and intelligence. In D.H. Saklofske & M. Zeidner (Eds.), International Handbook of Personality and Intelligence (pp. 417-446). New York: Plenum. ISBN0-306-44749-5^ Boyle, G.J. (2008). Critique of Five-Factor Model (FFM). In G.J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D.H. Saklofske (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment: Vol. 1 - Personality Theories and Models. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishers. ISBN9-781412-946513^ a b Widiger, Thomas A. (1995). "Review of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory". In Conoley, Jane Close; Impara, James C. (eds.). The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements. ISBN0-910674-40-X. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.^ Ben-Porath Y. S.; Waller N. G. (1992). "Five big issues in clinical personality assessment: A rejoinder to Costa and McCrae". Psychological Assessment. 4 (1): 2325. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.23.^ Murphy Paul, A. (2004). The cult of personality: How personality tests are leading us to miseducate our children, mismanage our companies, and misunderstand ourselves. New York: Simon and Schuster.^ Goldberg, Lewis (1999). "A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models" (PDF). Personality Psychology in Europe. 7. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press: 728 via Lewis R. Goldberg Personality Research Online Full-Text Archive.^ Kneevi, Goran; Radovi, Borislav; Opai, Goran (1997). "Evaluacija "Big Five" modela linosti kroz analizu inventara linosti NEO PI-R". Psihologija. 30: 3738.^ Mccrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (February 2004). "A contemplated revision of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory". Personality and Individual Differences. 36 (3): 587596. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00118-1.{{cite journal}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)^ Lewis R. Goldberg (1999). Mervielde, I.; Deary, I.; De Fruyt, F.; Ostendorf, F. (eds.). "A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models" (PDF). Personality Psychology in Europe. 7: 1417.^ Johnson, John A. (August 2014). "Measuring thirty facets of the Five Factor Model with a 120-item public domain inventory: Development of the IPIP-NEO-120". Journal of Research in Personality. 51: 7889. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003.^ Maples, JL; Guan, L; Carter, NT; Miller, JD (December 2014). "A test of the International Personality Item Pool representation of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory and development of a 120-item IPIP-based measure of the five-factor model". Psychological Assessment. 26 (4): 107084. doi:10.1037/pas0000004. PMID24932643.^ Yarkoni, Tal (2010-04-01). "The abbreviation of personality, or how to measure 200 personality scales with 200 items". Journal of Research in Personality. 44 (2): 180198. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.01.002. ISSN0092-6566. PMC2858332. PMID20419061.^ McCrae, R. R. & Allik, J. (Eds.) (2002), The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. N.Y.: Kluwer Academic Publisher.^ McCrae, R. R.; Costa, P. T.; Yik, M. S. M. (1996). "Universal aspects of Chinese personality structure". In Bond, M. H. (ed.). The handbook of Chinese psychology. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.^ Yik, M. S. M.; Bond, M. H. (1993). "Exploring the dimensions of Chinese person perception with indigenous and imported constructs: Creating a culturally balanced scale". International Journal of Psychology. 28: 7595. doi:10.1080/00207599308246919.^ Pulver, A.; Allik, J.; Pulkkinen, L.; Hmlinen, M. (1995). "The Big Five Personality Inventory in two non-Indo-European languages". European Journal of Personality. 9 (2): 109124. doi:10.1002/per.2410090205. S2CID143831077.^ McCrae, R. R.; Costa, P. T. Jr.; Del Pilar, G. H.; Rolland, J. P.; Parker, W. D. (1998). "Cross-cultural assessment of the five-factor model: The revised NEO Personality Inventory". Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 29: 171188. doi:10.1177/0022022198291009. S2CID145375858.^ Angleitner, A.; Ostendorf, F. (July 2000). "The FFM: A comparison of German speaking countries (Austria, Former East and West Germany, and Switzerland)". {{cite journal}}: Cite journal requires |journal= (help) Paper presented at the XXVIIth International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm, Sweden^ Lodhi, P. H.; Deo, S.; Belhekar, V. M. (2002). "The Five-Factor model of personality in Indian context: measurement and correlates". In McCrae, R. R.; Allik, J. (eds.). The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. NY: Kluwer Academic Publisher. pp.227248.^ Lima, M. P. (2002). "Personality and culture: The Portuguese case". In McCrae, R. R.; Allik, J. (eds.). The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. NY: Kluwer Academic Publisher. pp.249260.^ Martin, T. A.; Oryol, V. E.; Rukavishnikov, A. A.; Senin, I. G. (July 2000). "Applications of the Russian NEO PI-R". {{cite journal}}: Cite journal requires |journal= (help) Paper presented at the XXVIIth International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm, Sweden.^ Piedmont, R. L.; Chae, J. H. (1997). "Cross-cultural generalizability of the five-factor model of personality: Development and validation of the NEO PI-R for Koreans". Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 28 (2): 131155. doi:10.1177/0022022197282001. S2CID145053137.^ Glgz (2002). "Five-Factor Model and NEO PI-R in Turkey". In McCrae, R. R.; Allik, J. (eds.). The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. NY: Kluwer Academic Publisher. pp.175196.^ Leininger, A. (2002). "Vietnamese American personality and acculturation: An exploration between personality traits and cultural goals". In McCrae, R. R.; Allik, J. (eds.). The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. NY: Kluwer Academic Publisher. pp.197227.^ Piedmont, R. L.; Bain, E.; McCrae, R. R.; Costa, P. T. Jr. (2002). "The applicability of Five Factor Model in sub Saharan culture: The NEO PI-R in Shona". In McCrae, R. R.; Allik, J. (eds.). The Five-Factor model of personality across cultures. NY: Kluwer Academic Publisher. pp.155174.^ Rolland, J. P. (2000, July). Cross-cultural validity of the five factor model of personality. Paper presented at the XXVIIth International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm, Sweden.^ McCrae, R. R.; Costa, P. T. Jr.; Pedroso De Lima, M. P.; Simes, A.; Ostendorf, F.; Angleitner, A.; Marusi, I.; Bratko, D.; Caprara, G. V.; Barbaranelli, Claudio; Chae, Joon-Ho; Piedmont, Ralph L.; etal. (1999). "Age differences in personality across the adult life span: Parallels in five cultures". Developmental Psychology. 35 (2): 466477. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.35.2.466. PMID10082017.^ McCrae, R. R. (2001). "Trait psychology and culture: exploring intercultural comparisons". Journal of Personality. 69 (6): 819846. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.696166. PMID11767820.^ McCrae, R. R.; Terracciano, A. (2005). "Personality Profiles of Cultures: Aggregate Personality Traits" (PDF). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 89 (3): 407425. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.407. PMID16248722.^ Piedmont, Ralph L.; Braganza, Dinesh J. (2015). "Psychometric evaluation of responses to the NEO PI-3 in a multi-ethnic sample of adults in India". Psychological Assessment. 27 (4): 12531263. doi:10.1037/pas0000135. PMID25938339.^ Persson M.-L. Wasserman D.; G. Jonsson E.; Bergman H.; Terenius L.; Gyllander A.; Neiman J.; Geijer T. (July 2000). "Search for the influence of the tyrosine hydroxylase (TCAT)n repeat polymorphism on personality traits". Psychiatry Research. 95 (1): 18. doi:10.1016/S0165-1781(00)00160-8. PMID10904118. S2CID10631696.^ Mamoru Tochigi, Takeshi Otowa, Hiroyuki Hibino, Chieko Kato, Toshiyuki Otani, Tadashi Umekage, Takeshi Utsumi, Nobumasa Kato, Tsukasa Sasaki (March 2006). "Combined analysis of association between personality traits and three functional polymorphisms in the tyrosine hydroxylase, monoamine oxidase A and catechol-O-meethyltransferase genes". Neuroscience Research. 54 (3): 180185. doi:10.1016/j.neures.2005.11.003. PMID16360899. S2CID29304977.{{cite journal}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)^ Lesch, K. P., Bengel, D., Heils, A., Sabol, S., Greenberg, B., Petri, S., Benjamin, C., Hamer, D. & Murphy, D. (1996). "Association of Anxiety-Related Traits with a Polymorphism in the Serotonin Transporter Gene Regulatory Region". Science. 274 (5292): 15271530. Bibcode:1996Sci...274.1527L. doi:10.1126/science.274.5292.1527. PMID8929413. S2CID35503987.{{cite journal}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)PI-R Product Page for publisher of NEO PI-RInternational Item Pool, an alternative and free source of items available for research on personalityRetrieved from " Le NEO-PI-3 est l'instrument de rfrence au niveau international pour lvaluation de la personnalit. Utilis en psychologie clinique et dans les ressources humaines, il permet de dfinir un profil prcis de la personnalit pour les 5 grands domaines et 30 facettes (modle des Big Five) Le NEO-PI-3 mesure cinq grands domaines : Nvrosisme, Extraversion, Ouverture l'exprience, Agrabilit et Caractre Consciencieux, chacun tant subdivis en six facettes pour une analyse approfondie.Les contextes d'utilisation principaux sont les suivants :Ressources humaines : prcieux pour la slection et le dveloppement des talents, en identifiant les traits de personnalit influenant la performance professionnelle.Psychologie clinique : utilis pour valuer des profils de personnalit afin d'amliorer la prise en charge thrapeutique.Psychiatrie : complte les valuations psychiatriques pour une meilleure comprhension des troubles de la personnalit.###H4#TEXT[Les utilisateurs du NEO-PI-3]###Psychologues du travailPsychologues cliniciensChercheurs en psychologie de la personnalitPsychiatres###H4#TEXT[Le gold standard en psychologie]###Pour les psychologues, le NEO-PI-3 est le choix naturel pour l'valuation des traits de personnalit. Cet inventaire est galement plbiscit par les chercheurs, donc se retrouve surreprsent dans la littrature scientifique.###H4#TEXT[Des donnes exclusives]###En retour, toutes les connaissances produites viennent nourrir les rapports NEO-PI-3 qui restituent au psychologue, en fonction de son contexte d'utilisation, des informations fondes sur des preuves scientifiques : interprtations, croisements de scores, typologies de fonctionnement, vulnrabilits, liste de problmes potentiels de personnalit, ...###H4#TEXT[Tlchargez les exemples de rapport NEO-PI-3]###Rapport interprtatif clinique, destin au psychologueRapport interprtatif RH / candidat destin la personne valueRapport standardJe souhaite recevoir les 3 rapports...###BUTTON#PATH[#CLASS[GREEN]#TARGET[GREEN]#TEXT[Activit en RH]######BUTTON#PATH[#CLASS[GREEN]#TARGET[GREEN]#TEXT[Activit clinique]### Les cinq dimensions fondamentales de notre personnalit ouverture, conscience, extraversion, agrabilit et nvrosisme articules de manire unique chez chacun, influencent nos comportements et nos interactions.Nos traits de personnalit sont les filtres par lesquels nous percevons la ralit. Comprendre notre profil de personnalit permet de reprer avec fiabilit de nombreux aspects dterminants pour le psychologue, notamment :Le rapport au dangerLe niveau d'organisation ncessaire pour accomplir des tchesL'apptence pour la socialisationLa tendance rechercher la nouveautLes typologies d'interaction (coopration vs. comptition).La personnalit couvre galement le rapport que nous entretenons avec nos motions, positives ou dsagrables, souvent au cur de nos comportements.###H4#TEXT[Le NEO-PI-3 en Contexte RH]###Le NEO-PI-3 offre une analyse approfondie destine aux candidats pour comprendre leur fonctionnement grce des rapports interprtatifs croisant diverses facettes de la personnalit.Ce rapport de dveloppement personnel et professionnel, fond sur des contenus issus de la littrature scientifique, aborde des aspects tels que la zone de confort, les types de tches ou d'approches favorables, et les axes d'amlioration de la performance.Points abords dans les rapports RH :Rsolution des problmes et prise de dcisionsEfficacit dans la structuration de la penseOuverture d'esprit et originalitPlanification, organisation et mise en pratiqueStyle de relations interpersonnellesCaractre consciencieux###H4#TEXT[Des fonctionnalits pour le psychologue du travail]###Les psychologues du travail bnficient galement d'un rapport psychomtrique et de fonctionnalits avances comme le profil cible pour tablir un matching avec les caractristiques du poste et les valeurs de l'entreprise, ainsi que le classement de profil pour la prslection de candidats.Le NEO-PI-3 propose de nombreuses ressources telles que les 10 styles graph de personnalit (bien-tre, apprentissage, contrle de la colre, leadership, etc.) ou le job profiler.###H4#TEXT[Dcouvrir la formation NEO-PI-3]###Rserve aux psychologues, cette journe de formation permet une utilisation avance du NEO-PI-3, en contexte RH (recrutement, mobilit, orientation, dveloppement personnel, ...)###BUTTON#PATH[#CLASS[RED]#TARGET[GREEN]#TEXT[Dcouvrir la formation NEO]######H4#TEXT[Le NEO-PI-3 en contexte clinique]###Pour les cliniciens, le NEO-PI-3 inclut un rapport clinique qui offre une interprtation dtaille des scores pour chaque domaine et facette de la personnalit. Ce rapport clinique est structur en trois parties :L'interprtation des scores pour chaque domaine et facette de la personnalit.Les 10 styles graph qui permettent d'illustrer les interactions complexes entre diffrents traits de personnalit. Par exemple, le style de bien-tre ou le style de dfense met en lumire les tendances motionnelles et cognitives du patient.Les prvalences des problmes de personnalit associs aux scores extrmes du sujet valu.Les cliniciens utilisent le NEO-PI-3 pour comprendre le fonctionnement singulier du patient et dterminer les modalits thrapeutiques adaptes.###H4#TEXT[Rduire le drop-out]###Une valuation de la personnalit en dbut de thrapie permet notamment de rduire le phnomne de drop-out, cest--dire l'abandon prmatur du traitement par le patient, en facilitant une meilleure alliance thrapeutique et en optant pour une intervention thrapeutique congruente sa personnalit.Cette approche globale permet aux professionnels de la sant mentale d'optimiser leurs interventions et d'amliorer les rsultats cliniques en tenant compte des caractristiques individuelles de chaque patient. Ref-ID:FRA5602228 P-ID:FRAFRP100352 Le NEO PI-R (version franaise) comprend une liste de 240 affirmations auxquelles le rpondant donne un degr daccord sur une chelle de Likert 5 positions (de Fortement en dsaccord Fortement daccord). Une feuille de rponses autoscorable est prvue afin de faciliter le dpouillement des rponses du sujet. La passation peut se faire individuellement ou en groupe. Le temps imparti pour remplir ce questionnaire nest pas prdfini, mais est en gnral denviron 30 40 minutes. Lors du calcul des scores, il faut veiller ce que le nombre de rponses manquantes ne dpasse pas les 40 items (ou au maximum 3 items pour une mme facette). Trois questions supplmentaires de validit permettent de sassurer que le sujet a rempli le questionnaire compltement et de manire pertinente. Une feuille de profil permet de reprsenter les scores (bruts) de chaque sujet sur une trame construite sur la base de lchantillon normatif (et sparment pour les hommes et les femmes). Des tables dtalonnage standardises, disponibles en annexe du manuel, permettent de transformer les scores bruts en notes T. Chapitre 9 Questionnaire Analyse des profils Nous avons construit un questionnaire complmentaire, plus quali-tatif, pour trois raisons. La premire est damener les stagiaires poursuivre leur rflexion sur leurs profils dinteraction en classe. Dans cette optique, les rponses donnes ont galement fait partie de leurs dossiers dapprentissage32. La deuxime raison est davoir un certain nombre dinformations sur cette rflexion individuelle (savoir si les stagiaires arrivent mener une analyse des diffren-ces, connatre les lments qui, selon eux, ont un impact sur les profils, etc.). Troisimement, il sert connatre lavis des stagiaires sur la procdure (passation du PIS et feed-back) ainsi que leurs attitudes lgard de linstrument utilis. La premire version de ce questionnaire (voir en annexe, pp. 321-323) contient uniquement des questions ouvertes. Il est structur en trois parties : (1) comparaison des profils et analyse que fait le stagiaire des diffrences observes; (2) rflexion plus gnrale quant aux profils (validit des perceptions, utilit perue, etc.); (3) apprciation globale de la procdure. 32 Dossier qui peut tre dfini (Simon & Forgette-Giroux, 2003, p. 280) comme "un recueil cumulatif et continu par llve et/ou lenseignant/e, dun chantillon dindicateurs du progrs de llve vers le dveloppement dune comptence ainsi que de ses rflexions sur son cheminement, des fins dvaluation". Pour le stagiaire, ce dossier sert non seulement communiquer des informations sur sa formation pratique au matre-guide, mais galement le stimuler dans lauto-rflexion. Sur la base de lanalyse des rponses rcoltes avec cette premire version, certains regroupements ditems ont t effectus afin de formuler des questions de type ferm et disposer ainsi dun instrument dont le temps dadministration est rduit. On retrouve dans la seconde version (voir en annexe, pp. 325-328) la structure en trois parties, mais agence de manire quelque peu diffrente : (1) Comparaison des profils Les diffrences entre les quatre profils tant variables dun stagiaire lautre, nous avons gard deux ques-tions ouvertes concernant les comparaisons ent