How to Win a Career Achievement Award in Five Easy Lessons
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This professional autobiography is based on a talk given as the recipient of the 2009 Bruno Klopfer Distinguished Contribution Award. It includes a discussion of 5 of my habits that might be useful as a guide for future awardees including 1. send everything that you write to everyone you know (and ask for their help); 2. don’t be afraid to pick up what’s been dropped by others; 3. don’t be afraid to go away and then to stay away a long time; and 4. remember good ideas—they can be useful in the future. For the fifth and most important lesson, one must read the article.

LESSON NUMBER 1: SEND EVERYTHING THAT YOU WRITE TO EVERYONE YOU KNOW (AND ASK FOR THEIR HELP)

For all of my professional career, I’ve sent preview drafts of each of my reports to dozens of friends and colleagues, always asking for their help in making them better. Over the years, this particular bit of chutzpah has gained me an enormous amount of extraordinarily useful feedback, and my published reports have all profited from the wisdom of my peers. Exhibit 1 is the Author Note from Goldberg (1991), expressing my appreciation for such help (Figure 1). One might well argue that the reason that I have won any career awards is because many of my friends have taught me to think better and to write better about those thoughts. Indeed, I’ve even asked my gang to suggest topics for a career achievement address. Virtually everyone argued for something autobiographical rather than technical, and I will here try to oblige.

LESSON NUMBER 2: DON’T BE AFRAID TO PICK UP WHAT’S BEEN DROPPED BY OTHERS

An Example: The Taxonomic Challenge

My very first class as a college freshman at Harvard in 1949 was taught by Gordon Allport (Figure 2), who used for a textbook his classic 1937 volume Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. Chapter 11 in that text, titled “The theory of traits,” concluded with a section entitled “The problem of trait names,” describing the Allport and Odbert (1936) compendium “Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study.”

Allport hoped to work with Odbert or others of his students to develop a taxonomy of the nearly 18,000 trait names that they had culled from the 1925 edition of the unabridged Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language, rather than leaving that project with merely those four long alphabetical columns of trait terms. But it was not to be: Allport himself was not much of an empirically oriented scientist, and none of his students took on this taxonomic challenge.

That remained for Raymond B. Cattell (Figure 3), who saw the wisdom of combining the personality dictionary provided by Allport and Odbert with the techniques of cluster analysis and factor analysis of which he was so enamored. Although Cattell (1943, 1945, 1947) had made a heroic beginning, he arrived on the scene too early in technological history, living still in an age when hand calculations reigned and computers were in their infancy.

That’s two dropped taxonomy balls, and one to go. Warren T. Norman (Figure 4) had just obtained his PhD from the University of Minnesota when he took his first and only faculty position, starting as an instructor in 1957 at the University of Michigan. He wasn’t there more than a few weeks when his department head, E. Lowell Kelly, who had just been elected President of the American Psychological Association, asked him to serve on the dissertation committee of a very bumbling youngster, one
of whose committee members had gone away on leave. Thus began a friendship and intellectual collaboration (e.g., Norman & Goldberg, 1966) that lasted until Warren Norman’s early death in 1998 (see Goldberg, 1998, for an appreciation).

It was Warren Norman who took up the Allportian challenge, intending to finally provide a scientifically compelling taxonomy of personality characteristics, based on what I later dubbed the “lexical hypothesis” (Goldberg, 1981). And, it was Norman (1967) who was the first to collect empirical data on a subset of roughly 2,800 of the 18,000 terms in the Allport-Odbert compendium; and it was Norman (1963) who persuaded Goldberg that the next great challenge of a scientific personality psychology was to solve the riddle of personality structure. Then, he too dropped that ball.

What makes an extraordinarily brilliant young scientist burn out at an early age? If we can answer that question, we may come to understand how Norman correctly identified a crucial scientific problem, contributed enormously to its solution, but then stopped in mid tracks. In his explosive burst of brilliance and intellectual exuberance, he infected me, and I came to believe that it was my calling to carry on his vision. I always believed that the problem was going to be too difficult for me to solve, but that it was important enough to devote a lifetime to working on it (e.g., Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004; Ashton, Lee, Goldberg, & de Vries, 2009; Goldberg, 1982, 1990, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1995; 2001; Goldberg & Rosolack, 1994; McCormick & Goldberg, 1997; Peabody & Goldberg, 1989; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996a, 1996b, 1998, 2001, 2002, 2003).

It is not yet solved, of course, but we have made some gains.

A Second Example: The Hawaii Cohort

Here is another example of picking up what others have, in this case inadvertently, dropped. From 1961 to 1965, I worked as a consultant to the U.S. Peace Corps, serving as a Field Selection Officer, selecting Peace Corps trainees to serve in
various countries in Southeast Asia, including the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. All of these projects trained on the Big Island in Hawaii, and in my role as a selection officer, I met with each training group at the beginning, middle, and end of their 3-month training period—virtually always in beautiful Hilo, Hawaii.

Being in Hawaii every 6 weeks or so, I met some colleagues teaching at the University of Hawaii, one of whom, Jack Digman (Figure 5), became one of my dearest friends. Unknown to me at the time, during the years from 1959 to 1967, Digman had persuaded 88 elementary-school teachers on the islands of Oahu and Kauai to describe each of their students at the very end of the school years. All of the teachers rank ordered their students on each of about 50 personality traits, originally selected by Cattell but later augmented by Digman so as to be as comprehensive as possible. In total, Digman obtained personality descriptions on about 2,400 kids in the first, second, fifth, and sixth grades. By analyzing some subsets of this rich data pool, Digman (1963, 1965, 1989, 1990; Digman & Inouye, 1986; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981) discovered five robust factors that generalized across subsamples, thus making an important contribution to what I later dubbed the “Big-Five” factor representation (Goldberg, 1981).

The years went by. Digman’s wife moved to Lorane, Oregon, where she ran a horse ranch, and Jack followed her. He needed something of his own to do, and so elected to work with us at the Oregon Research Institute (ORI) in Eugene. Our colleague, Sarah Hampson, and others at ORI, kept urging Jack to apply for funds to study those elementary school children 40 years later when they were now adults. It took awhile, but in 1998, he received a research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), entitled “Personality and Health: A Longitudinal Study,” to locate as many as possible from that original child cohort. Within a few months of receiving this grant, Jack died—suddenly and unexpectedly. We were all devastated.

The research grant needed a Principal Investigator, and although I had not been part of this project, I was asked to take over. Now 12 years later, our team, which includes Sarah Hampson and Joan Dubanoski, has (a) located over 80% of the original cohort (Hampson et al., 2001); (b) administered a series of health-related questionnaires to most of them; and (c) recruited many of them to participate in a comprehensive physical-medical-psychological examination at the Kaiser Permanente Center for Health Research in Honolulu.

Already, in a project that we hope will follow this cohort to the end of their lives, we have made some important discoveries: We have found strong links between childhood personality traits (such as Conscientiousness) and adult health-related behaviors such as smoking and health outcomes such as obesity (e.g., Hampson, Goldberg, Vogt, & Dubanoski, 2006, 2007). And, in a first study of personality-trait stability over the 40-year span between elementary school and middle adulthood, we found substantial differences in long-term stability between different types of traits. Traits related to Extraversion and Conscientiousness seem to have considerable stability, whereas traits related to Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism) and Agreeableness seem to have virtually no stability at all (Hampson & Goldberg, 2006). Our research grant is now funded by the National Institute on Aging, with Sarah Hampson as its Principal Investigator.

A Third Example: Vocational Choices

As an undergraduate at Harvard, I took no courses in the Psychology Department, which at that time included Skinner, Boring, Stevens, and a host of other such luminaries. Yet as a college junior faced with a decision about what to do with my life, I decided to obtain graduate training in psychology—for the obvious reason that psychology would teach me all about people, and knowledge of people would be useful in any profession I might later elect to enter. Oh, sure. Once in the graduate program in Clinical Psychology at the University of Michigan, which was highly psychodynamic in orientation, I found myself skeptical about the scientific status of all that Rorschach-inkblot prognosticating to which I was being exposed.

So, I set out to test whether clinical psychologists making predictions from projective protocols were experts or quacks, and these early excursions into the accuracy of human judgments remained a theme of my research for the next two decades (e.g., Goldberg, 1968, 1970, 1991). After a first study examining whether brain-damaged patients could be distinguished from psychotic ones by their after images from watching a rotating Archimedes spiral (Goldberg & Smith, 1958), I studied clinical expertise in diagnosing brain damage using a popular projective procedure of that era, the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt test (Pascal & Suttell, 1951). In my first contribution to the scientific literature on clinical judgment (Goldberg, 1959), I showed that experienced clinicians, clinical psychology graduate students, and hospital secretaries were all equally valid diagnosticians, but that the secretaries were more confident in their judgments than the other two groups. Thus, I argued, for this task one should use one’s secretaries because with no loss in accuracy, they would feel a lot better about what they were doing.

At that time, it was not common for graduate students to publish reports of their research, but before I finished my
degree, I had published two articles (Goldberg, 1959; Goldberg & Smith, 1958), the one on clinical accuracy being widely reprinted. Among those who read that article was Paul J. Hoffman (Figure 6), who was starting to achieve some fame from a classic Psychological Bulletin article entitled “The paramorphic representation of clinical judgment” in which he argued that human judgments could be captured by multiple regression equations linking the numerical values of the cues that are used to the numerical values of the predictions from those cues (Hoffman, 1960). A few years later in my life, I was to join Hoffman in Eugene, Oregon, where he had just started a new organization called the Oregon Research Institute (ORI; Figure 7). At ORI we were joined by Leonard Rorer (whose 1965 article on “The Great Response-Style Myth” became a classic of that period), then later by Paul Slovic and Sarah Lichtenstein, and in one of the headiest years of our young lives by Amos Tversky and Dan Kahneman who conducted their early studies of judgmental heuristics and biases with us at ORI.

Now back to my penchant for picking up stuff dropped by others. As a graduate student at Michigan, the clinical psychologist who made the most sense to me was the one who became my advisor and friend, Lowell Kelly (Figure 8). Kelly, with his student Donald Fiske, had conducted a large-scale study of all incoming graduate students in clinical psychology throughout the United States immediately after World War II, and their 1951 report (Kelly & Fiske, 1951) of that study entitled “The Prediction of Performance in Clinical Psychology” became a milestone in the history of psychological assessment. However, despite the title of that classic volume, Kelly and Fiske had obtained no information about the actual work “performance” of their graduate-student cohort, intending to collect such criterion information in the years ahead. Another ball was about to get dropped.

For my doctoral dissertation, I picked up this particular ball, and began a massive detective hunt to find the members of this graduate-student cohort 10 years later in their lives. In this, my first longitudinal investigation, I managed to locate 95% of the original cohort, and 100% of those who had gone on to obtain their PhD degrees in psychology. I showed that the kind of work that these individuals ended up doing (clinical practice, academic teaching/research, or administration) was predictable from their personality and interests when they first entered graduate school (Kelly & Goldberg, 1959). This early research stimulated an interest in occupational choices, an interest that lay dormant for many decades until recently when I began developing new public-domain measures of vocational and avocational preferences (e.g., Goldberg, in press).

Lesson Number 3: Don’t Be Afraid to Go Away and Then to Stay Away a Long Time

My first academic job was at Stanford University where the faculty superstars included Leon Festinger, Richard Sears, Jack Hilgard, Quinn McNemar, and Alex Bavelas. In the office across from me was a youngster named Albert Bandura, and a few doors...
away was an even younger Jerry Wiggins (Figures 9 and 10), with whom I cotaught a graduate assessment course and with whom I outlined a textbook in assessment that would eventually become that great Wiggins (1973) classic, Personality and Prediction: Principles of Personality Assessment. I had been hired as a temporary 1-year replacement, which then got renewed for a second year. When the time came to take a permanent position, I joined the faculty at the University of Oregon in Eugene, which has remained my residence for almost 50 years. But, unlike most folks I know, whenever I could take a leave, I stayed away for a year or more at a time, and these years away from home have been the most stimulating ones in my life.

A number of colleagues have remarked to me that my years spent away from home have been followed by periods of rich scientific productivity, but I have always doubted those observations. It was not until a few days ago that I discovered any scientific evidence for their conclusions; in a series of experimental and naturalistic studies, Maddux and Galinsky (2009) found evidence that long periods spent living in other cultures are associated with increased creativity.

My first sabbatical was spent at the University of Nijmegen in The Netherlands, where as a Fulbright Professor I got to visit the five other psychology departments in Holland at that time and to meet most if not all of their faculty members. The most famous psychologist of that era was Adriaan De Groot (Figure 11) who pioneered the study of expert decision making in chess (e.g., De Groot, 1965) and whom I invited to spend a year with us at ORI, during which time I helped edit his classic volume on Methodology (De Groot, 1969), which he had translated from Dutch to English. But it was a young whippersnapper at the University of Groningen, Willem Hofstee (Figure 12), who ended up as one of my closest and most stimulating of colleagues. Wim Hofstee visited us at ORI on a number of occasions, along with his students Arend Tomas and Frank Brokken (Figure 13), whose doctoral dissertation (Brokken, 1978) was an early milestone in lexical research; Frank has now visited the United States so frequently that he owns a truck parked in Eugene. It is Wim Hofstee who deserves primary credit for the development of the Abridged Big-Five dimensional Circumplex (AB5C) model integrating dimensional and circular representations of the Big-Five domains (Hofstee, de Raad, & Goldberg, 1992).

By the end of my first European sabbatical, it had become obvious to Jerry Wiggins and to me that my heart lay in empirical analyses, not in textbook writing, and thus that Jerry should complete our assessment volume on his own. When that book finally came out (Wiggins, 1973), it was dedicated “To ORI: The people and the concept.”

During the 1971–1972 academic year, I got to hang out with Ravenna Helson and Harrison Gough (Figure 14) in the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) at the University of California in Berkeley, and with Jack Block (Figure 15), usually at his home. Jack and I had met years earlier at a convention in Honolulu, where we spent hours on a beach discussing the crazy response-set wars of that period, ongoing discussions that culminated in Block’s (1965) remarkable critique, “The Challenge of Response Sets.” While spending a year with Block in Berkeley, I accompanied him on his weekly excursions to San Francisco to pick up, each from a different small specialty shop, his weekly assortments of wines, pastas, cheeses, sausages,
bagels, rolls, and bread-sticks. Once through those demanding errands, it was time for our weekly dim-sum Chinese lunch.

The Netherlands was cool, Berkeley was hot (especially during these years of frenzied counter-cultural protests), but Turkey provided the ultimate kind of experience. During a Fulbright-supported year in Istanbul in the mid-1970s, I got to explore a city diametrically opposite of my home in Eugene, Oregon, in so many ways that it could take my breath away. I taught courses at Istanbul University, the oldest university in the Middle East, and certainly the most entertaining. During the days, I walked the streets of this ancient city, and when the sun went down, I savored the sights and sounds along the mighty Bosphorus. Roughly once a month, I wrote a raki-enfused account of our adventures, and the collection of these unpublished “Letters from Turkey” became something of an underground collector’s item. In my second letter, I described a period of “Unmitigated gawking, while walking every side-street, sniffing every smell, visiting every mosque, riding every ferry, bus, and dolmus I could find.” It was one hell of a ride, and one hell of a year.

Had I not spent that year in Istanbul, would I have still devoted so much time to studying the Turkish language of personality? Strangely, the two periods of my life were not connected. Two decades after my Istanbul odyssey, a young Turkish psychologist, Oya Somer, discovered the lexical
hypothesis, the Big-Five factor structure, and me. She obtained the data; I planned the analyses; and together we published two articles describing our many findings from this ancient Altaic language (Goldberg & Somer, 2000; Somer & Goldberg, 1999).

But, another full year abroad was connected to my earlier Dutch sabbatical. Probably because of my friendship with Wim Hofstee, I was invited to spend a year as a fellow-in-residence at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS), in Wassenaar, near the Hague in the Netherlands. Frank Brokken set up a computer connection between my NIAS office and his Groningen computer center, which had the most advanced academic computer system in Holland at that time. Where I had once learned to program in Fortran II, I could now use SPSS to do it for me, and so again I could function as my own data analyst, which I did all day most of the days of that wonderful year.

When not computing, I was driving—from Bielefeld in Germany to Wassenaar in Holland with stops in Groningen along the way—with my new graduate student, Oliver John (Figure 16). Oliver had been an undergraduate at Bielefeld with Alois Angleitner, who sent Oliver on a scouting expedition to interview Block, Wiggins, Fiske, Jackson, Mischel, and Goldberg in search of an ideal personality graduate program. Somehow I won out, and Oliver came to team up with Bill Chaplin (Figure 17) at Oregon, and then returned to Bielefeld during my year at NIAS. Through Angleitner, Oliver and I met Sarah Hampson (Figures 18 and 19), and together John, Hampson, Chaplin, and Goldberg (Figure 20) spent eight heady years studying personality traits as semantic categories, eventually discovering a basic level in personality trait hierarchies (e.g., Chaplin, John, & Goldberg, 1988; Hampson, John, & Goldberg, 1986; John, Hampson, & Goldberg, 1991).
LESSON NUMBER 4: REMEMBER GOOD IDEAS—THEY CAN BE USEFUL IN THE FUTURE

Back when I was an undergraduate at Harvard, I read Henry Murray et al.’s (1938) classic volume, Explorations in Personality: A Clinical and Experimental Study of Fifty Men of College Age. Perhaps I didn’t get much past the Preface of that long tome, at least at that early stage of my life, but it was in that short preface that Murray raved about the advantages of using the same sample of research participants to study many different topics. He argued that if different investigators collected data from the same sample, the resulting data pool would be rich enough so that one could check on possible alternative explanations for one’s findings using data obtained by others.

Murray implemented this plan with Harvard undergraduates, although that kind of sample has a shelf-life of only 4 years. But, the general idea is a winner.

More than 40 years after I first came across that idea, Gerard Saucier (Figures 21–23) and I obtained an NIMH grant, “Mapping Personality Trait Structure,” which had elicited a high enough priority score to win a Merit Award, thus doubling the length of our grant. Now with eight years of guaranteed funding, the time seemed right to solicit our own pet sample. We needed to find individuals who would be living stably in the community for at least the next 10 years, and therefore university students and other transients were out. Instead, we solicited participants from lists of home owners, asking folks if they wanted to help...
of criteria were quite small, suggesting some sort of common emotional disorders. Perhaps the most remarkable of our many clinical indicators known to be associated with various kinds of personality descriptions by knowledgeable informants, and (c) coefficients for 11 inventories predicting each of three kinds of core of personality-trait variance measured by these seemingly quite diverse inventories (Grucza & Goldberg, 2007).

Data from our community sample have been provided freely to a host of investigators throughout the world. Yet, the many who have used ESCS data are but a tiny fraction of those who have used the public-domain measures available at the IPIP Web site (Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006). The same research grant that funded our community sample supported this international collaborative, which now includes around 2,500 personality items and around 250 personality scales. English IPIP items have now been translated into more than 30 other languages, and the IPIP Web site already lists over 300 publications that have used IPIP scales.

It was Willem Hofstee of the University of Groningen in the Netherlands who called attention to the fact that those single trait-descriptive adjectives used in lexical studies of personality structure are not ideal items to include in personality inventories because they are too broad and abstract in their nature, and perhaps because of this, it is often difficult to find exact one-to-one translations across languages: in many cases, terms that seem descriptively identical differ in their evaluations. Hofstee and his students (e.g., Hendriks, Hofstee, & de Raad, 1999) pioneered the use of short verbal phrases, which are more contextualized than single adjectives but still more compact than many items included in popular inventories, and these verbal phrases are used for all IPIP items. Examples include: “Believe in an eye for an eye.” “Can read people like a book.” “Dislike being the center of attention.” “Enjoy the beauty of nature.” “Forget appointments.” “Get upset easily.” “Have gotten better with age.”

By far my favorite IPIP item is “Am able to disregard rules,” because I like both the structure and the content of that IPIP item: Note that it describes an ability (“am able to”), not a failing (“can’t help”) nor a propensity (“tend to”); and it concerns “rules” rather than “laws.” Breaking rules can be good for you, if the rule-breaking hurts no one else and if one knows what one is doing and why one is doing it. If you are the kind of person who is not able to disregard rules, perhaps you might give it a try.

Actually, rule-bound conformity is better than taking oneself too seriously. What I really believe is that in the battle between frivolity and ponderousness, it is better to veer to the light-hearted (Figure 24).

My final lesson for winning a career achievement award is by far the most important.

LESSON NUMBER 5: SHAVE YOUR HEAD, STAY HEALTHY, AND OUTLIVE THE COMPETITION
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Thus was born the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample (ESCS), a loyal stable of research participants who have now completed by mail over 30 questionnaires covering an enormous range of topics, including personality traits, values and attitudes, vocational and avocational interests, possessions, current and past activities, aspects of psychopathology and of physical health, talents and skills, and exposure to potentially traumatic events both in childhood and adulthood. Remarkably, over the decade between 1994 and 2004, virtually all participant attrition was due to death or disability. In addition to the extraordinary collection of self-report measures we have obtained, participants wrote projective stories to TAT pictures, and most of them have been described by two or three individuals who knew them well.

Over the years, members of this sample have completed a wide array of current personality inventories, including the NEO PI–R (Costa & McCrae, 1992), California Psychological Inventory (Gough & Bradley, 2002), Sixteen Personality Factor questionnaire (Conn & Rieke, 1994), Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1995), Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (Tellegen, in press), Jackson Personality Inventory (Jackson, 1994), Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger, Przybeck, Svrakic, & Wetzel, 1994), and HEXACO–PI–R (Lee & Ashton, 2004). The availability of so many inventories, all developed to provide broad bandwidth assessments of normal personality functioning, suggested the possibility of a comparative-validity horse race. In a study conducted with Rick Grucza of Washington University medical school in St. Louis, we used multiple regression analyses and bootstrap resampling procedures to provide cross-validity coefficients for 11 inventories predicting each of three kinds of criteria: (a) the frequencies of occurrence of diverse activities, (b) personality descriptions by knowledgeable informants, and (c) clinical indicators known to be associated with various kinds of emotional disorders. Perhaps the most remarkable of our many findings is that interinventory differences across the entire range of criteria were quite small, suggesting some sort of common
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