

Personality and
intelligence concepts
are closely related
psychology essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Intelligence or personality](#) \n \t
2. [Measuring and testing personality](#) \n \t
3. [Reliability issue](#) \n \t
4. [Validity issue](#) \n \t
5. [Empirical evidences that support arguments above](#) \n \t
6. [Conclusion](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

Personality and intelligence concepts are closely related. Personality describes a set of character traits that are measurable, and it is the supreme of the inmate psychology of a living being (Carver and Scheier, 2000). Intelligence on the other hand, is one of supporting elements of personality, and it supports components of personality thus sometimes considered part of the personality. It is not easy to define personality. Personality means an attempt to focus on essence of individual, the scientifically description, and understanding of a person. Together with intelligence, the scope of personality contains the crucial area of an individual study. Personality was derived from Latin word ' persona' meaning ' mask'. Personality itself is understood as the study of masks that people wear. These are people's projections and displays that are personas but consist of inner parts of psychological experience which are termed as ' our self'.

Intelligence or personality

Many questions are raised on whether intelligence should be taken as an element of personality. Both intelligent and personality when critically analyzed pose mental constructs which cause impact on individual understanding of one's self and their world. Theories regarding multiple intelligences and emotional existence of intelligence have contributed to bigger similarities between personal characteristic traits and intelligences. Personality traits for instance is usually related when measurements between validity and variability is done. These measurements of personality traits define dimensional personality types including feeling versus thinking, judging versus perceiving and extroversion versus introversion (Hans, 2006).

Some types of intelligence represent identified elements within variant intelligence views including emotional intelligence. Tomas (2007) argues that some intelligence factors are closely linked to combination factors such as motivational, frustration, reputational mood and those other factors that make a person feel something. Intelligent factors are linked with personality elements including traits like feeling and sensing. The distinct element between the intelligence and personality are different in that personality appears more linked to early socialization, and reveals a set of behaviors that exist in ones' self. People commonly confuse personality and those underlying personality factors. Intelligence therefore, needs to be categorized under those underlying factors of personality. Personality and intelligence are often tested and measured simultaneously to give correlation determinants between personality aspects and intelligence related capabilities.

It should be noted that intelligence and personality are closely related to functionality terms, but intelligence should not be confused as a component of personality. The differences of both can be clearly understood when measuring reliability and validity and testing their variations. Hence, intelligence is mechanism support for personality formation.

Measuring and testing personality

The personality measurements and other psychological variables amount to measuring the immeasurable. It is difficult to measure psychology but what is needed for it to vary is assigning a number of variables. People normally judge others for having specific personality characteristics than another person. For example, when a person is hostile or rigid, it is hard to quantify these characteristics (Haslam, 2007). Personality can be measured within psychology and measurements are always a concern in psychology discipline. Psychologists argue that one should understand personality measurement on serious empirical research.

Scientific understanding of personality measurement and testing relies on having confidence in measurements. Scientists pay a lot of attention when dealing with personality measurements and testing because it is deceptively complicated. Measurement quality or confidence issues are normally broken into two components substantially the reliability and validity. Reliability and validity accounts for the entire personality measurements though the concepts require careful examination.

Reliability issue

Reliability in personality measurements refers the extent to which characteristic measurement is accurately and dependably reflected.

Consistency and reliability forms three main varieties that are measurements among components of different types for example, test items. Consistency measurements extracted from information of different users that are inter-rater reliability. The third variability is measurements of people's scores for a certain time that is test-retest reliability. All these consistency forms of lack in measure and suffer from ' measurement error' (Haslam, 2007).

Therefore, a reliable measure is that one which consists of free error assessment of a construct. They correlate in such a manner that its different components need to be together in a coherent way to produce similar scores whenever any person uses it. A reliable measure when tested to another usually results to consistent scores. Unreliable measure is not coherent thus provides wrong scores whenever anybody uses it, and their scores differ when testing to another. When a person is being tested, such a measure does not provide a reliable result but rather substantial measurement error occur. Pre-testing of items is done to maximize test reliability, and ensure correlation of items with one another is achieved. It also ensures high score is maintained with reduction in variability among the testers and at different times.

Validity issue

It is a complicated issue in personality measurement and testing. The concept revolves around the two questions that are " does a measure assess what is intended to asses, and does it give practically useful information?"
<https://assignbuster.com/personality-and-intelligence-concepts-are-closely-related-psychology-essay/>

(Haslam, 2007). A validity measure is that produces accurate measure when psychological construct what is requires to measure. For instance, validity measure of one construct test should not measure another construct or measure a portion of it. That is arrogance test does not measure self-esteem and general anxious test does not test social anxiety. This validity when empirically demonstrated shows high-correlation measures with other measurements at the same construct that is arrogance and anxiety. The distinct constructs measures especially self- esteems and dominance are convergent validity, and depression and shyness are termed discriminated validity. The content of the measure can be support validity and represent true construct of interest instead of related construct.

From the second question, validity needs to show practical useful information. It should produce information that assists psychologists to predict on what the construct need to be associated with that is predictive validity. For instance conscientiousness measure need to predict attendance of selfless work, and trait anxiety measure should distinguish people suffering from related anxiety disorders. Therefore, measures that cannot produce clear predictions of the real-life situation are not used. Validity is thus an accuracy tool for measuring the concept of it is intended measure.

Scientific researches normally use external and internal validates in measuring and testing personality. External validity is the extent to which study results generalizes. Internal validly focuses on conduction of the study. It takes into account the study design, care shown in measurements conduct, concern issues on what and what was not measured. Internal

validity also shows the extent to which study designers account for alternative explanations in exploring casual relationships.

Reliability and validity are determinants of psychometric properties that are crucial in any assessment methods of evaluating personality. If reliability and validity are absent, then measurements are termed as incoherent inaccurate or ineffective. They can all fortunately be accomplished through the use of empirical research on criteria prediction and correlation measures. Reliability and validity are linked because reliability cannot be low when validity is high. Validity and reliability are inconsistent measures that are internally incoherent, and yields different information to various examiners and changes over time (Robert and Paul 2003).

Scientists argue that personality measurements especially personal characteristics can be measured in principal putting empirical approach in question on how accurate they are practically measured. Different psychologists look at some variables of personality as unobservable often construct theory subjective to some degree, and can still be rigorously measured well. Careful analysis of validity and reliability in personality measurements gives more assurance on getting information. Therefore, psychometric credentials are established in case one needs to make practical judgments in is measuring personality (Maltby, Day and Macaskill, 2007).

Empirical evidences that support arguments above

Using critical thinking we might evaluate an argument for instance personal character trait. When one improves critical thinking skills, he or she also

improves on fluid intelligence, which also results to data interpretations, to appraise evidence and evaluate arguments on one's personality. Skills and critical thinking dispositions are an empirical question on how one can determine the personal characteristics of an individual. Often scientists base on empirical research to get practical evidence on their research study when using validity and variability measurements.

A number of scientific researches were done to investigate simultaneous consideration of personality traits, aging and well-being. The level of conception according to John, Robins and Pervins (2008), distinguished between changes of age in personality adjustments versus growth in personality, determining the former in view of chosen traits of well-being, and leaving the later in the mix of selected well-being, emotion regulation and having wisdom. Some scientific researchers have attempted to employ personality traits through the use of empirical integration to control variables, and to measure if the links between ageing and well-being have different adjustments in traits. Only those with particular personal traits between ageing and well-being are linked like interaction terms.

Matthews, Dearly and Whiteman (2003), considered personal traits and influences of contextual as controls in their different variables that link age to positive and negative effect. However, they examined age interaction with extraversion in giving predictions on men's positive effect. The results showed that older introverted men have higher positive effect unlike younger introverted men whereas the relationship among extraverted men was not strong (Snyder, Lopez and Pedrotti 2010).

Empirical research has examined various approaches and trait theory in understandings and characterizing individuals and their differences. The disposition approach is one of the empirical researches carried out to give clear evidence on individual behaviors. The fundamental goal of disposition approach is to characterize all people in comprehensive terms but in a stable behavioral disposition or their differed factors. In across all situations, the factors are assumed to remain invariant and to determine the critical range of behaviors (Tomas 2007). Another processing approach focuses personality as a system organized to mediate units and psychological processes that interact individual experiences on a situation. Basically, processes of co-responsive involved in personality development through various approaches that examine the gene effects and environments in an aggregate sense. Particularly, empirical research illustrates the pattern of expression and suppression through studying specific genes and specific environments (Gian and Daniel 2000).

Conclusion

Measurements of individual differences have led to ongoing problems for psychologists in that sometimes are hard to determine the better responses than the other. Personality characteristics such as nonconformity or critical thinking often pointed out disturbs psychologically in one way or another. Scientific researchers have tried to analyze personal traits through proper use of reliability and validity, but these measurements if not well used cannot give clear correlations. There is a need to understand empirical approaches because it gives clear evidence on personal traits make people appreciate its argument. Lastly, Careful analysis of validity and reliability in

personality measurements should be used to give more assurance on data analysis. Therefore, psychometric credentials are established in case one needs to make practical judgments in is measuring personality traits.