

Running Head: Personality of comedians

Comedians' mean level and stage personalities: Evidence for goal-directed personality adaptation.

(9,794 words, 3 tables)

Abstract

Recent findings have shown that both mean levels of personality and situational variability in its expression are of importance. So here, the Big Five personality traits of 77 professional and 125 amateur stand-up comedians were compared to two large matched samples (N>100,000). The comedians were also observed whilst performing, which enabled a comparison of their stage personalities with situational requirements on 10 selected NEO-PIR facets. Both amateurs and professionals showed higher openness-to-experience, extraversion, and lower conscientiousness than their norm samples, while professionals also evidenced greater neuroticism. Irrespective of trait standing, with regard to most NEO-PIR facets, professionals expressed the appropriate on-stage persona, and were better able to regulate their personality to conform to situational requirements than amateurs. This is consistent with research showing that individuals regulate their personality to conform to situational and goal requirements, and adds the finding that successful comedians demonstrate enhanced adaptability compared to amateurs.

Keywords: Organizational Behavior, Personality, Whole Trait Theory, Comedians,

Invariance

Comedians' Mean Level and Stage Personalities

Personality has two major components: Trait levels and moment-to-moment personality expression. In essence, these components mean that people have a typical level, of say Extraversion, but sometimes (perhaps often) deviate from this typical level. Both trait levels and personality expression are important for understanding human personality, especially within work or performance domains. Trait levels have received the most attention, but recent evidence suggests that around 65% of the variance in behavior is explained by moment-to-moment personality expression (or intra-individual variability), which is about twice that of variance attributable to trait levels (or inter-individual variation; Fleeson & Gallagher, 2009; Sherman, Rauthmann, Brown, Serfass, Jones & John, 2015). Further, growing evidence shows that intra-personal variability in personality expression is systematic and is related to situational characteristics (e.g., Fleeson & Law, 2015; Sherman et al., 2015) and current goals (e.g., Bleidorn, 2009; Heller, Komar & Lee, 2007; McCabe & Fleeson, 2013; Perunovic, Heller, Ross & Komar, 2011).

Building upon these observations, the current study seeks to examine both aspects of personality within a real-world, high-stakes occupational setting using comedians. Specifically, the study has two major goals. First to examine the trait profiles of comedians, and to examine if and how they differ from the general population. Second, we seek to examine whether both professionals and amateurs adapt/change their personality expression when on stage and whether such adaptations are associated with performance levels. Comedians were chosen because evidence suggests that they are likely to have a unique profile of personality trait levels, and also because the demands of their role vary between writing and performing. In addition, although comedic performances are somewhat contrived (like any employee giving a presentation), they do constitute a part of the job role which is relatively short, easily observable, and thus highly amenable to study.

Personality trait profiles

First we explore the personality trait profiles of amateur and professional comedians as compared with two very large matched samples. Why should comedians' mean level personalities differ from those of the general population? Perhaps one of the most useful frameworks to explain this is Roberts' (2006) ASTMA (Attrition-Selection-Transformation-Manipulation-Attrition) model¹. Roberts reviews evidence that personality shows both stability and change over the lifespan, and argues that person-job transactions might influence both through 5 mechanisms. Persons are: (1) attracted into, and (2) selected for occupations which fit their personality; (3) in the course of performing their job role people's personalities are transformed in a direction which conforms with its demands; (4) they manipulate their environment to better fit their personality, sometimes known as job crafting (Sutin & Costa, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001); and (5) they leave jobs which do not fit their personality, a phenomenon denoted as attrition (Denissen, Ulferts, Ludtke, Muck & Gerstorf, 2014).

The ASTMA transactions suggest that employment typically acts to entrench employees' existing trait profiles, because they are attracted and selected into roles that 'fit' their personality, and are subsequently exposed to situations which reinforce these trait levels. However, work experiences can also 'transform' personality. A number of theories elaborate on the reasons for transformation of personality. However, TESSERA arguably offers the most comprehensive framework (Wrzus & Roberts, 2017). "The ... TESSERA framework posits that long-term personality development occurs due to repeated short-term, situational processes. These short-term processes can be generalized as a recursive sequence of Triggering situations, Expectancy, States/State expressions, and Reactions (TESSERA)." (Wrzus & Roberts, 2017, p. 253). In other words, carrying out any job role will repeatedly expose one to a range of job-specific situations with their associated expectancies, states and

1
2
3 reactions. If such situations require repeated expression of personality states at odds with
4
5 one's trait levels of personality, personality will likely change in a direction consistent with
6
7 occupational requirements. In sum, the above processes of personality development should
8
9 shape job incumbents' personalities in a direction which tends towards person-environment
10
11 fit (Woods, Wille, Wu, Lievens, & de Fruyt, 2019).
12
13
14

15 What evidence is there then that different occupations are associated with distinctive
16
17 and homogenous personality profiles? There are relatively few investigations directly
18
19 relevant to this question (Bradley-Geist & Landis, 2012; Denissen et al. 2014; Jordan, Herriot
20
21 & Chalmers, 1991; King, Ott-Holland, Ryan, Huang, Wadlington & Elizondo, 2017;
22
23 Ployhart, Weekley & Baughman, 2006; Satterwhite, Fleenor, Braddy, Feldman & Hooper,
24
25 2009; Schaubroek, Ganster & Jones, 1998), and although they all support the basic
26
27 contention, they do so to different degrees. For example, King et al. (2017), in one of the
28
29 larger and more comprehensive studies, found that variance due to occupational grouping
30
31 was small and accounted for 4%, 6%, and 3% of the total variance in Neuroticism,
32
33 Extraversion and Conscientiousness, respectively. In contrast, Denissen et al. (2014), in a
34
35 similarly large study, reported correlations between ratings of required personality and
36
37 averaged occupational personality profiles of .57, .54, and .69 for Extraversion,
38
39 Agreeableness and Openness, which suggests strong support for homogeneity of personality
40
41 within occupations. It is not clear why findings are so discrepant, even with regard to
42
43 extraversion, the only personality dimension common to these two studies, and it is possible
44
45 as argued by Schmidt and Oh (2010), on the basis of extensive research (e.g., Schmidt &
46
47 Hunter, 1998; Schmidt, Shaffer & Oh, 2008), that for many jobs there is little discrimination
48
49 in personality requirements.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Personality trait profiles of comedians

Let us suppose for the moment that comedy is one profession which requires a distinctive personality profile to achieve success. What does that profile look like? To address this question, we adopt the Five-Factor Model (FFM), which, although criticized on both theoretical and methodological grounds (e.g., Block, 1995; Paunonen & Jackson, 2001), remains the consensus model of personality and possesses numerous advantages, especially the large reference databases pertaining to it (see John, Naumann & Soto, 2008; McCrae & Costa, 2008; Miller & Lynam, 2015).

For the majority in the UK, the job of stand-up comedians is comprised of two major tasks: Writing material and performing. Feist (1998) provides a meta-analysis relevant to the likely personality profiles of ‘creative artists’ who write as part of their occupation. Feist compared the personality profiles of creative artists/writers and non-artists. Following Cohen’s (1988) suggestion that *d*-scores of around .20 represent small effects, .50 moderate effects and .80 large effects, Feist (1998) found that artists were strongly less conscientious, moderately more open and showed small tendencies to be more neurotic, extraverted and disagreeable than non-artists. However, Silvia, Kaufman, Reiter-Palmon, and Wigert (2011) recently showed that agreeableness has a near zero correlation with creativity, and that previous studies have probably used measures which confound disagreeableness with immodesty, and should not, therefore, be relied on. Further, Feist found, using the Creative Personality Inventory, that creative artists were more impulsive, nonconformist, rule-doubting, skeptical, and independent (all effects medium-large). Creativity is defined as generating novel ideas (Hughes, Lee, Tian, Newman, & Legood, 2018) for which openness to ideas would appear to be a prerequisite, and indeed openness- to-experience has been the most consistent correlate of creativity (Kaufman et al., 2014; Silvia et al., 2011). In addition, to be novel often requires a rule-breaking mentality, and those with a propensity to create

1
2
3 humor tend to be somewhat low in deference (Thorson & Powell, 1993). So, the comparative
4
5 openness and low conscientiousness of creative artists is understandable in these terms, as
6
7 well as consistent with the evidence.
8
9

10 Of relevance to the presenting aspects of stand-up comedy is a small study by Nettle
11
12 (2006) of the personality characteristics of actors. Although comedy and acting differ, they
13
14 share the requirement for presenting. Nettle compared 191 actors with a norm sample, and
15
16 found d-score differences of .02 for conscientiousness, .62 for openness-to-experience, .20
17
18 for neuroticism, .60 for extraversion, and .41 for Agreeableness. As compared with creative
19
20 artists, presenters share high openness, are similar in terms of a weak tendency to
21
22 neuroticism, but are substantially more agreeable, extraverted, and conscientious. On this
23
24 basis, comedians should be high on openness-to-experience as this characteristic is common
25
26 to both their roles. Otherwise their characteristics will depend on how the conflicting
27
28 demands of writing and presenting balance out. Likely low conscientiousness predominates
29
30 because of the necessity of a rule breaking mentality to generate sufficiently interesting
31
32 material. In terms of the remaining characteristics, if we assume that the effects of stage
33
34 performance are relatively weak, given its short duration, then comedians should be mildly
35
36 neurotic, somewhat more extraverted, and about the same in agreeableness compared with the
37
38 normal population.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Most studies that have investigated comedians' personality traits directly suggest that
45
46 comedians exhibit high levels of neuroticism (Fisher & Fisher, 1981; Janus, 1975; Janus,
47
48 Bess, & Janus, 1978). These studies use psychometrically weak projective measures, and rely
49
50 on small samples, which renders their findings questionable. However, the conclusion that
51
52 comedians are neurotic is reinforced by a large scale study (N=523) by Ando, Claridge and
53
54 Clark (2014). In a comparison of comedians with actors (N=350) they found a d-score
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 difference of .51 for Bi-polar traits and .35 for Schizotypy. Overall, these studies suggest that
4
5 neuroticism is a core characteristic of comedians.
6

7
8 Greengross and Miller (2009) is the only study which has used the FFM to investigate
9
10 comedians' personality traits. They compared professional (N=31) and amateur (N=9)
11
12 comedians to humor writers (N=10) and college students (N =400) using self-report NEO-
13
14 FFI-R scores. In line with our theorizing, comedians of both groups showed significantly
15
16 higher openness and lower conscientiousness compared to the students. Yet, they also
17
18 showed lower extraversion and agreeableness, while no significant difference was found on
19
20 neuroticism. No significant difference was found between amateur and professional
21
22 comedians on any trait. However, the size of Greengross and Miller's comedian samples was
23
24 very small and students represent a questionable norm group. Thus, investigation of the five
25
26 factors in a larger comedian sample, in comparison to a representative general population
27
28 group, is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn.
29
30
31
32

33 The first aim of this study is to build on Greengross and Miller's (2009) findings
34
35 whilst addressing some of its limitations. Specifically, we explore the FFM personality
36
37 characteristics of amateur and professional comedians, in comparison to two matched UK
38
39 samples, utilizing self-report measures. The norm samples were substantially larger than
40
41 those of all previous studies, as were the comedian samples, with the exception of the study
42
43 of Ando et al., (2014). Based on our consideration of Feist's (1998) meta-analysis, Nettle's
44
45 (2006) study of performers, together with direct studies of comedians' personality, we
46
47 expected comedians will score lower on conscientiousness and higher on openness, while the
48
49 preponderance of evidence points to elevated levels of neuroticism, and extraversion and
50
51 similar levels of agreeableness compared to the general population, given that previous
52
53 investigations likely used a confounded measure of agreeableness (Silvia et al., 2011).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In a further refinement on previous work, we take advantage of methodological
4 advances which offer more comprehensive and reliable analyses for investigating group
5 differences. Collectively, Multi-Group Covariance and Mean Structures Analysis (MG-
6 CMSA) adopts structural equation modelling to test for equivalence of the covariance
7 structure within a given measure, and uses this robust structure to compare latent mean
8 differences in the target constructs (Dolan & Molenaar, 1994). Measurement invariance tests
9 the assumption that the construct is measured equivalently across groups. Most commonly,
10 the pattern of factor loadings (configural), degree of factor loadings (metric) and the
11 intercepts of indicators (scalar) are assessed for invariance (Widaman & Reise, 1997). Only if
12 invariance holds can precise estimates of group mean differences be calculated (French &
13 Finch, 2006; Meredith, 1993). Finch and West (1997) suggest that tests of invariance are an
14 important step forward in personality research and assessment of group differences. This is
15 the first study to apply this methodology to comedians' personality.

16
17
18 In addition, we were able to control for three known confounds which would certainly
19 have affected our estimates, namely, age, gender, and country of residence. It is well
20 established that personality varies across gender (e.g., Del Giudice, Booth & Irwing, 2012),
21 age (Roberts, Walton & Viechtbauer, 2006) and country of residence (Allik, et al. 2017) and
22 the population of comedians differs from the general population with respect to all three
23 (Chortle, 2019). Because we had a very large comparison group, we were able to select a
24 large number of exact matches (on age, gender, and country of residence) to each member of
25 the comedian groups. Under these circumstances, exact matching is a preferable strategy to
26 propensity score matching (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983)

27 **Adaptiveness of Comedians' Stage Personalities**

28 Because standup comedians have to perform the material they write, they often find
29 themselves adopting a persona that, in many cases, differs significantly from their everyday
30

1
2
3 personality. For example, comedians often express rage or confusion to entertain and elicit
4 emotional reactions from their audience. From one perspective, expressing a set of
5 personality states at odds with trait levels might be considered a unique feature of the
6 comedians' role. However, recent research suggests that most people actually shift their
7 personality expression across situations, usually to match situational requirements, and to aid
8 goal attainment. Accordingly, we assess whether comedians shift their personality when on
9 stage and, if so, whether this aids performance.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 As we noted in the introduction, recent empirical evidence and theoretical
20 developments (Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015) emphasize the importance of assessing
21 personality trait levels and personality expression on the same dimensions (Fleeson, 2001). A
22 series of studies using experience sampling methods have shown that intra-individual
23 variability in personality expression accounts for about 65% of variance in behavior, with
24 35% of variance attributable to inter-individual variation (Fleeson & Gallagher, 2009;
25 Sherman et al., 2015). Some of the most interesting findings in this domain revolve around
26 density distributions of moment-to-moment personality expression (i.e., the distribution of
27 expressed levels of say, conscientiousness). Notably, density distributions have been found to
28 be stable. Correcting Fleeson's (2001) stability estimates, using the Spearman-Brown
29 formula, shows average reliabilities for mean personality expression (i.e., level of a trait
30 expressed) of .97 and for the standard deviation (i.e., the amount of variation in trait
31 expression) of .85 across the Big 5 factors². Thus, variability in personality expression is a
32 consistent feature of an individuals' personality.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 The stability of variation in personality expression can also be explained by
52 examining the role of situations and goals. Specifically, a considerable body of evidence
53 shows that that intra-personal variability in state personality is situation dependent (e.g.,
54 Fleeson & Law, 2015; Sherman et al., 2015) and that personality states covary with current
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 goals (e.g., Bleidorn, 2009; Heller et al., 2007; McCabe & Fleeson, 2013; Perunovic et al.,
4
5 2011). Such evidence is in line with social cognitive theory (e.g. Bandura, 1997; Mischel &
6
7 Shoda, 1995) in that variation in personality expression appears to result, at least in part, from
8
9 person-situation transactions mediated by interpretive processes, and motivational processes
10
11 (goals and expectancies).
12
13

14
15 A perhaps more puzzling issue is that some investigations seem to show that
16
17 variability in personality states can be dysfunctional (Clifton & Kuper, 2011; Cote et al.,
18
19 2012; Fournier et al., 2009; Russell, Moskowitz, Zuroff, Sookman, & Paris, 2007; Zeigler-
20
21 Hill, Masri, Smith, Vonk, Madson & Zhang, 2013), whilst others show that it can be
22
23 functional (Lievens, Lang, De Fruyt, Corstjens, de Vijver, & Bledlow, 2018; Minbashian,
24
25 Wood, & Beckman, 2010). Here we suggest a possible approach to resolving this paradox.
26
27 Earlier in this paper we considered evidence that particular personality profiles provide a fit
28
29 to different jobs such that persons with such profiles achieve greater success within the job.
30
31 We infer that this is based on the proposition that their personality is adaptive for the range of
32
33 situations they are likely to encounter within their job-role. Implicit in this framework is that
34
35 success in any given situation is dependent on expressing a personality profile which fits the
36
37 situation. It would follow that those who consistently express the personality profile needed
38
39 to achieve success in each situation, will be more successful than those who are unable to
40
41 match situational requirements. It is possible then, that those who are able to regulate their
42
43 expression of personality to match situational requirements are adaptive, whilst those who
44
45 show inappropriate variation of personality expression are not.
46
47
48
49

50
51 Following this logic, we examine whether comedians do indeed shift their personality
52
53 when on stage, whether any shifts appear to be goal-directed, and examine whether
54
55 professionals are better able to shift than amateurs. In assessing this, we propose that the
56
57 match between expert ratings of the personality requirements for success in a situation and
58
59
60

1
2
3 expressed personality will provide a suitable measure of adaptive personality expression. By
4
5 definition, our sample of professional comedians has achieved greater success than the
6
7 amateur or would be comedians. We therefore predict that their expression of personality on
8
9 stage will correspond more closely to expert ratings of situational requirements than is true
10
11 for amateurs, and that this will be true across the range of personality states in which they
12
13 differ. We investigate this issue using behavioral ratings of video recordings of stage
14
15 performances in a high-stakes setting, i.e. one of the premier UK venues for stand-up
16
17 comedy. In doing so, we meet the call of Baumeister, Vohs, and Funder (2007) for studying
18
19 “actual” behavior.
20
21
22

23 24 **Method**

25 26 **Participants**

27
28 Comedians were recruited through a live comedy venue, which is widely regarded as
29
30 one of the two preeminent UK comedy establishments. Professional comedians were
31
32 employed to perform at professional shows, were testing new material at a ‘new material’
33
34 show, or were the master of ceremonies at an amateur night. Amateur comedians either
35
36 performed in a ‘gong show’ or worked, unpaid, at a professional show. Both groups were
37
38 operating in a high stakes situation, the professionals to further their career and the amateurs
39
40 to establish one. The sample comprised 77 professional comedians (67 males, 10 females,
41
42 Mean age = 35.8, $SD = 7.8$) and 125 amateur comedians (107 males, 18 females, Mean age =
43
44 28.7, $SD = 8.1$). The proportion of female comedienne in our sample at 13.9% is smaller
45
46 than the 27.4% of female circuit comedienne (Chortle, 2019). Amongst the amateur
47
48 comedians, 21.6% had a postgraduate university education, 35.2% had undergraduate
49
50 university education, 17.6% had non-university higher education, 11.2% had secondary
51
52 school education to age 18, and 14.4% had secondary school education to age 16, as their
53
54 highest level of education. Amongst the professional comedians, 29.9% had a postgraduate
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 university education, 33.8% had undergraduate university education, 13.0% had non-
4
5 university higher education, 9.1% had secondary school education to age 18, and 14.3% had
6
7 secondary school education to age 16, as their highest level of education. The sample size
8
9 was limited by practical considerations, although the multi-group confirmatory factor
10
11 analysis has adequate power due to the equality constraints imposed (see below). The two
12
13 separate comparison groups for amateur and professional comedians were drawn from a
14
15 general population sample of 333,442 UK residents, collected through multiple studies and
16
17 provided by Samuel Gosling.
18
19
20

21 **Procedure.**

22
23
24 Comedians were approached via email by the club's general manager and/or in person
25
26 on the night of their performance. Participants completed the Big Five Inventory. All, except
27
28 gong show participants, completed the questionnaire on the night of their performance in the
29
30 comedy club dressing room. Gong show participants were emailed the questionnaire, which
31
32 they completed within two weeks of their performance³. Participants consented to have their
33
34 performance recorded by the comedy club. Due to technical failures 24 of these recordings
35
36 were not available for analysis.
37
38
39

40
41 With the comedians' agreement, two experts viewed and rated a five minute sample
42
43 of their videoed performance. However, for gong show comedians, the sample period only
44
45 lasted until they were 'gonged'. The experts were an internationally successful comedian and
46
47 the comedy club's Technical Director.
48

49 **Measures**

50
51 **Self-reported personality.** The Big Five Inventory (BFI: John & Srivastava, 1999)
52
53 comprises 44 items assessing extraversion, neuroticism, openness, conscientiousness and
54
55 agreeability. Participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree,
56
57 5=strongly agree). The BFI demonstrates strong internal consistency ($\alpha \approx .83$), a clear factor
58
59
60

1
2
3 structure, and convergence with other Big Five measures (John & Srivastava, 1999). In the
4
5 current study Cronbach alpha reliabilities ranged from .74 to .84 with an average of .80.
6
7

8 **Behavioral observation.** Ten comedy-relevant facets of personality formed the basis
9
10 of the observation. They included four facets of neuroticism, one each of extraversion and
11
12 openness, two of agreeableness, and two of conscientiousness (see Table 2). To identify
13
14 these, interviews were run with two comedians. The 30 NEO-PIR facets (Costa & McCrae,
15
16 1992) were described to interviewees. In response to each, interviewees were asked to
17
18 indicate if the facet (1) is observable when comedians perform; (2) impacts comedians'
19
20 effectiveness; and in line with the possibility that personality variability is a necessity for
21
22 performing successful stand-up comedy, (3) requires variation across performances. Twelve
23
24 facets met all criteria according to both interviewees. These were Angry Hostility,
25
26 Straightforwardness, Self-consciousness, Assertiveness, Ideas, Compliance, Self-discipline,
27
28 Anxiety, Deliberation, Impulsiveness, Activity, and Gregariousness.
29
30
31
32

33 Next, descriptions of the twelve facets were paired with a five-point response scale
34
35 (1=to a great extent, 5=not at all). They were then presented to twelve further industry
36
37 experts, via an online survey, who were asked to indicate the extent to which each requires
38
39 variation across performances. Experts had multiple roles in the comedy industry including
40
41 comedy club manager/director, reviewer, headline comedian, agent, television comedy
42
43 producer, promoter, and a festival director. Out of the twelve presented facets, the ten which
44
45 required the most variation across performances were selected for inclusion in the study. On
46
47 this basis Activity and Gregariousness were excluded.
48
49
50

51 For the observational study, the poles of each facet were defined and combined with a
52
53 ten-point scale where 1 denoted the low end of the facet and 10 denoted the high end. Each
54
55 facet along with its response scale was presented twice. In response to the first, the two
56
57 experts were asked to indicate the level that was needed for comedians, to as achieve as high
58
59
60

1
2
3 a level of success as possible, due to their performance. In response to the second, they rated
4
5 the comedians' expressed behavior in relation to the facet. The reliability of the mean ratings
6
7 of situational requirements with respect to the ten facets was 0.86 across the two sets of
8
9 expert ratings. To control for the possibility that requiring the two experts to rate both
10
11 required and observed behavior may have created a method artefact, we obtained a further
12
13 sample of 11 professional comedians who provided independent ratings of required behavior.
14
15 The means of the two sets of ratings correlated at .99. Since the original ratings were
16
17 recorded immediately after watching the videos of stage performances (about 180 times), and
18
19 were, therefore, not subject to biases due to reliance on memory, we used these ratings in
20
21
22
23
24 subsequent analysis.

25 26 **Results**

27
28 Amateur and professional comedians were exactly matched on gender and age to
29
30 cases from the reference sample of UK citizens. This was done via the 'Matchit' algorithm
31
32 (Ho, Imai, King, & Stuart, 2011) in R 3.4.1 (R Development core group, 2008). It led to the
33
34 matching of 126,905 reference participants to 77 professional comedians and to 191,631
35
36 reference participants to 125 amateur comedians.

37
38 We then tested for mean differences in BFI scores for professional and amateur
39
40 comedians, separately, in comparison to their respective norm groups using Multi-Group
41
42 Covariance and Mean Structures Analysis (MG-CMS) in Mplus. Because it is well
43
44 established that the BFI does not provide a good fit using conventional confirmatory factor
45
46 analysis (Booth & Hughes, 2014), and the fit of a CFA to the total sample of comedians was
47
48 poor ($\chi^2(194)=511,417.9$, $p<.001$; CFI=.789; TLI=.775; RMSEA=.076 [.076-.076]), we used
49
50
51
52
53 multi-group exploratory structural equation modelling (MG-ESEM).

54
55 For group comparisons to be valid, scalar invariance must hold (Little, 2013). We
56
57 considered good model fit to be indicated by values within the range of $\leq .06$ –.08 for the root
58
59
60

1
2
3 mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and $\geq .90$ –.95 for the Tucker-Lewis index
4
5 (TLI) and comparative fit index (CFI) (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Schermelleh-Engel,
6
7 Moosbrugger, & Muller, 2003). We tested for measurement invariance in the order: (1)
8
9 configural invariance; (2) metric invariance; and (3) scalar invariance using procedures
10
11 recommended by Millsap and Kim (2018) adapted for the ESEM framework. Decline in
12
13 model fit at a given stage of the invariance analysis indicates that the assumptions of
14
15 invariance do not hold in the constrained parameters (French & Finch, 2006). To assess
16
17 possible decline in model fit, we rely on the conclusions of a simulation study by Chen
18
19 (2007). Her primary recommendation, when sample sizes are 500 or more, is that changes of
20
21 equal to or less than -0.01 for CFI and increases less than or equal to .015 for the RMSEA
22
23 indicate that invariance holds.
24
25
26
27

28 [insert Table 1 about here]

29
30 In this instance, according to both criteria, and for both sets of analyses, increasingly
31
32 restrictive models showed improved rather than reduced fit, and the scalar models showed
33
34 excellent absolute fit which provides unambiguous support for scalar invariance (see Table
35
36 1). All salient item loadings were significant at $p < .001$, and barring three items, were in the
37
38 range 0.50-0.87 (see supplementary materials, Tables 1 & 2). The average variance extracted
39
40 (AVE) for each factor ranged from 28 to 49%. Given that scalar invariance is convincingly
41
42 demonstrated and that each of the factors is reliable (McDonald's Omega ranges from .78-
43
44 .89; see supplementary materials, Tables 1 & 2), it follows that the mean differences between
45
46 groups are on the same measurement scale and are substantively interpretable.
47
48
49

50 [insert Table 2 about here]

51
52 The mean differences between groups are shown in Table 2 in the form of Cohen's d-
53
54 scores, with 95% confidence intervals. Cohen (1988) suggested that d-scores should be
55
56 considered small, medium, and large, at levels of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8, respectively. However, he
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 also cautioned that uncritical use of such arbitrary guidelines is dangerous. Nevertheless,
4
5 according to these guidelines: In terms of neuroticism amateurs were indistinguishable from
6
7 the normal population, while professionals, as expected, showed a medium level of
8
9 neuroticism. Amateur comedians are more extraverted, to a medium degree, than the normal
10
11 population while professionals show only a small trend in this direction. Both amateurs and
12
13 professionals showed moderately higher levels of openness than the normal population, and
14
15 neither are distinguishable from the normal population with respect to agreeableness. Finally,
16
17 both groups are less conscientious than the normal population to a medium degree. Although
18
19 point estimates show that professionals are markedly more neurotic than amateurs, amateurs
20
21 are somewhat more extraverted, and professionals are less conscientious, none of these
22
23 differences achieve significance, probably because of a lack of power.
24
25
26
27

28
29 The heightened level of neuroticism and openness and low conscientiousness of
30
31 professional comedians conforms to previous studies (e.g., Feist, 1998; Greengross & Miller,
32
33 2009). Equally, that professionals differ only weakly from the normal population in terms of
34
35 extraversion, and are indistinguishable in terms of agreeableness is consistent with our
36
37 expectations. In addition, the moderately high level of openness demonstrated by professional
38
39 comedians fits with the requirements of the job according to our two experts (see Table 3).
40
41

42
43 If we compare the mean level personality of professional comedians with the
44
45 requirements of the job as judged by our experts (see Table 3), they are too high in
46
47 neuroticism, too low in extraversion, met with requirements with respect to openness, and
48
49 agreeableness, and are somewhat deficient in conscientiousness.
50

51 [insert Table 3 about here]
52
53

54
55 Our second set of analyses concerned the extent to which behavioral ratings of the ten
56
57 facets of expressed personality, described previously, matched the expert ratings of required
58
59 stage personality depending on whether the participants were amateur or professional (see
60

1
2
3 Table 3). Specifically, we expected that the expressed stage personalities of professional
4 comedians would conform more closely to the personality requirements of successful stage
5 performance as rated by experts, than is true of amateurs. We tested this proposition by
6 conducting a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), in SPSS version 23.0, using
7 professional versus amateur status as the categorical independent variable and the 10
8 personality facets chosen from the FFM as dependent variables. We used multiple imputation
9 since 10.38% of cases would have been lost with casewise deletion (see supplemental
10 materials section 2). Using Pillai's Trace as the multivariate criterion we found a significant
11 main effect of professional vs. amateur status on the 10 FFM facets ($V = .245$, $F = 5.58$, $df_1 =$
12 10 , $df_2 = 16-72$, $p < .001$). Thus, the discriminant variate explained 24.5% of the total
13 variance. To explore further which personality variables explained the differences between
14 amateur and professional comedians, we carried out a series of univariate analyses of
15 variance using a Bonferroni correction. Six personality facets showed a significant mean
16 difference between amateur and professional comedians: Self-consciousness and Anxiety
17 (Neuroticism), Assertiveness (Extraversion), Intellectual Curiosity (Openness-to-experience),
18 Compliance or rather its lack (Agreeableness), and Deliberation or rather its lack
19 (Conscientiousness). In all cases where there was a significant difference, as expected, the
20 professional comedians expressed personality conformed more closely to the requirements of
21 effective stage performance than did that of amateurs (see Table 3).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We then repeated the previous multivariate analysis of variance but this time
47 controlling for age as a covariate. Pillai's Trace dropped such that the discriminant variate
48 explained only 18.7% of the total variance ($V = .2187$, $F = 3.94$, $df_1 = 10$, $df_2 = 171$, $p <$
49 $.001$), and two of the differences (Compliance and Deliberation) became non-significant (see
50 Table 3).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The results in Table 3 show that generally professional comedians conform well to the
4 requirements of stage performance. With regard to neuroticism, even though professionals
5 show higher levels of trait neuroticism than do amateurs, when on stage, professionals
6 express appropriate levels of self-consciousness and anxiety, and score much lower than
7 amateurs. Given that amateurs, in terms of mean level, are normal with respect to neuroticism
8 but are much higher on the facets of self-consciousness and anxiety in terms of their stage
9 presence, it is clear that professionals are much better able to adapt to the requirements of the
10 stage and show much greater movement from their trait levels. With regard to the other two
11 facets of neuroticism (angry hostility and impulsiveness), amateurs and professionals are
12 similar and apparently both too high. The assertiveness facet of extraversion follows a similar
13 pattern. Although professionals describe their trait levels of extraversion as lower than
14 amateurs, on stage the professionals show a higher and appropriate level of assertiveness,
15 whilst amateurs fail to exhibit a sufficiently high level of this trait. With regard to openness,
16 while both amateurs and professionals describe their trait levels similarly, on stage
17 professionals exhibit a much higher level of openness than amateurs, albeit short of what is
18 apparently optimal for performance. In terms of the agreeableness facets of
19 straightforwardness and compliance, while professionals and amateurs are similar with
20 respect to straightforwardness, professionals exhibit a level of compliance much closer to
21 requirements than do amateurs. Similarly, in terms of the two facets of conscientiousness:
22 With regard to self-discipline, professionals and amateurs are both able to match task
23 requirements, despite the professionals describing their trait levels of conscientiousness as
24 relatively low, whilst professionals better meet requirements for lack of deliberation.

Discussion

25 Both professional and amateur comedians showed unique trait-level personality
26 profiles as compared with the normal population. Both were more open-to-experience, less
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conscientious, and more extraverted than their corresponding norm samples, while
4
5 professionals additionally showed greater neuroticism. For comedians at least then, the
6
7 prediction derived from the ASTMA (Roberts, 2006) and the TESSERA frameworks (Wrzus
8
9 & Roberts, 2017), that comedians have a distinctive personality profile which conforms to the
10
11 requirements of their profession, appears to hold (see below).
12
13

14
15 It should also be noted, that while our findings show a unique personality profile for
16
17 the job of comedians, the contention of Schmidt and Hunter (1998) that a common
18
19 personality profile predicts success across the majority of jobs may still hold (see Schmidt &
20
21 Oh, 2010). However, the personality profile of comedians differs markedly from that found to
22
23 confer an advantage in most work situations. Barrick, Mount, and Judge (2001), in their
24
25 summary of meta-analytic findings, found that conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness-
26
27 to-experience correlated with work performance at .24, -.15, and .07, respectively. According
28
29 to the ASTMA model, this would imply that the personality profile for most jobs would
30
31 comprise an elevated level of conscientiousness, low neuroticism, and lowish levels of
32
33 openness. So our findings show that comedians are much less conscientious, and much more
34
35 neurotic and open-to-experience than would normally characterize most jobs.
36
37
38

39
40 Arguably a much more significant finding was that professional comedians'
41
42 expression of personality on stage was more adaptive than was true for amateurs, and by a
43
44 considerable margin. This occurred despite professionals' mean-levels of neuroticism and
45
46 extraversion diverging more from stage requirements than was so for amateurs. Moreover,
47
48 this greater adaptability was evidenced across six personality facets spanning all of the FFM
49
50 factors of personality. This suggests the existence of a general mechanism for regulation of
51
52 personality expression to situational requirements. Although, an individual level analysis of
53
54 our findings should shed more light on this.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, when we controlled for age, the difference between amateur and
4 professional comedians reduced overall and two of the differences became non-significant.
5 We interpret this as indicating that regulation of personality expression increases with age,
6 suggesting it can be learned through experience. Most likely this learning occurs both due to
7 general and domain specific practice (in our case the greater experience of professional
8 comedians with stage performance), however, our analysis is not informative with respect to
9 this distinction.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The findings also support our contention that variability in personality may be either
20 functional or dysfunctional depending on whether the change in personality is in a direction
21 consistent or inconsistent with situational requirements. This suggests a possible resolution of
22 the apparent paradox that personality variability may be dysfunctional (Clifton & Kuper,
23 2011; Cote et al., 2012; Fournier et al., 2009; Russell, et al., 2007; Zielger-Hill, et al., 2013),
24 or functional (Lievens, et al., 2018; Minbashian et al., 2010). In short, measures of match will
25 reflect functional variation whilst measures of mismatch will index dysfunctional variation in
26 personality.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The strong suggestion in our findings that there is an individual difference in capacity
38 to regulate personality expression in accordance with situational requirements may help
39 explain another longstanding puzzle. Meta-analyses show that the effect of mean-level
40 personality on job performance is useful but surprisingly small (Barrick, Judge & Mount,
41 2001), and this is also found, although to a lesser degree, at the facet level of analysis (Judge,
42 Rodell, Klinger, Simon & Crawford, 2013). In the somewhat limited case of comedians, it
43 seems clear that this job requires variation in personality expression depending on whether
44 the comedian is writing material or presenting. Given that most jobs vary in situational
45 requirements, it may be that the ability to express personality in an adaptive manner may be
46 more predictive of job performance than is trait-level personality.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our expectation that professional comedians are high on neuroticism, openness, and
4 extraversion, low on conscientiousness, and show no difference with regard to agreeableness
5 compared to the general population, was supported. However, this prediction was based on
6 the assumption that the creative writing role of comedians would predominate over the
7 performance role, so the trait personality profile of professional comedians indicates that they
8 are similar to those involved in roles which require a high degree of creation (e.g., Feist,
9 1998), rather than roles which are performance orientated (e.g., Nettle, 2006). Nevertheless,
10 in most regards professional comedians seem able to express the appropriate persona when
11 they perform, irrespective of their mean personality levels. That is, they are adept at
12 regulating their personality to conform with job requirements, at least while they are on stage.
13 This fits with and extends the findings that individuals adapt their personality characteristics
14 to fit situational requirements (Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015). Fittingly, the pattern of
15 adaption is indicative of movement from the trait characteristics of an individual employed in
16 a creative role towards that of one employed in a performance role. That is, in line with the
17 situational requirements as rated by the experts, professional comedians showed increased
18 levels of extraversion and agreeableness during their performance compared to their trait
19 score, and much less neuroticism. This makes their situational (on-stage) personality
20 expression more similar to performers than their trait scores (Nettle, 2006).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 A partial exception from this pertains to neuroticism. While professional comedians
46 seem able to regulate their self-consciousness and anxiety to an appropriate level on stage,
47 according to our experts they are nevertheless somewhat too high on angry hostility and
48 impulsiveness as compared with amateurs, albeit these differences are slight. While our
49 experts are of considerable distinction and command substantial experience, are they actually
50 correct that angry hostility and impulsiveness are prejudicial to a stage performance? It
51 seems more likely that the elevated scores of comedians on neuroticism is due to neurotic
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 traits conferring an advantage. There are at least two possibilities consistent with this
4
5 suggestion.

6
7 First, with regard to trait levels of neuroticism, it is well established that humor is a
8
9 protective factor with respect to stress and depression (Southwick, Vythilingam, & Charney,
10
11 2005; Thorson, Powell, 1993). Thus, having a neurotic personality may be a strong motivator
12
13 for comedians to deploy humor in everyday life. In addition, extensive practice is a pre-
14
15 requisite for the development of expertise (Ericsson & Kintsch, 1995). Given that neuroticism
16
17 likely motivates comedians to practice humor in everyday life, they probably develop a
18
19 commensurate expertise with respect to humorousness, which would suit them for the
20
21 profession. Of course, we did not ask our experts about mean levels of neuroticism, so there
22
23 may actually be no discrepancy in this respect.

24
25
26
27
28 However, in more direct contradiction, it could be argued that neurotic traits directly
29
30 contribute to the effectiveness of comedic performance. To take just one comedian (John
31
32 Cleese), angry hostility and impulsivity seem quintessentially what make him funny and
33
34 conforms to his general persona in Fawlty Towers. Although comedians differ, virtually all
35
36 stand-up comics exhibit angry hostility, impulsiveness, and other neurotic traits as part of
37
38 their performance. Indeed, it is the transgressive nature of comedy, which plays on our fears
39
40 of embarrassment, which often makes it funny. John Cleese inadvertently referring to World
41
42 War II, when serving a German customer, is amusing because he is aware of his social
43
44 transgression yet cannot avoid it. It arouses our fear that we may perpetrate something
45
46 equally gauche. With any great comedian from Hancock to Milligan, surely it is the lack of
47
48 control of neurotic traits which makes them funny.

49
50
51
52
53 We are arguing then that trait neuroticism is a more or less essential characteristic of
54
55 successful comedians, and we can agree with our experts that the novelty or unexpectedness
56
57 of successful comedy stems from openness (Kaufman et al., 2014; Silvia et al., 2011). So,
58
59
60

1
2
3 these characteristics of professional comedians are required if comedians are to achieve in
4
5 their profession.
6

7
8 While our sample of comedians is large compared with previous samples, especially
9
10 when considering the intensity of the study, nevertheless we cannot claim that the sample is
11
12 representative, either of professional or amateur comedians. The sample was ultimately a
13
14 convenience sample and limited in size by time considerations. Necessarily, some of our
15
16 findings are likely sample specific. Equally this was an exploratory study with all its
17
18 concomitant weaknesses. Also, although use of MG-CMSA and exact matching represents a
19
20 substantial advance on previous studies of comedians, there was one covariate we were
21
22 unable to control for, viz. educational level, which likely would have biased our estimates to
23
24 a small degree. We must also acknowledge that there may be other unmeasured variables
25
26 which may potentially have acted as confounds.
27
28
29

30
31 Overall, this study has shown that, as would be predicted by the ASTMA model
32
33 (Roberts, 2006), comedians, as an occupational group, have a distinctive personality profile.
34
35 Interestingly, this profile, consisting of low conscientiousness, moderate neuroticism, and
36
37 high openness, differs substantially from the personality profile most typically associated
38
39 with job success (Barrick & Mount, 2001). Further, the results emanating from the
40
41 assessment of on stage personality expression are consistent with the substantial body of
42
43 work which shows that people regulate their personality expression in order to meet with
44
45 situational and goal requirements (e.g., DeYoung, 2014; Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015).
46
47 What the current findings add to the literature is that successful job incumbents, at least in the
48
49 comedy field, show a much greater degree of adaptability than do amateurs, probably both
50
51 due to greater experience and a stronger capacity for self-regulation.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Notes

¹There are a number of theoretical frameworks other than those considered here, which are relevant to the issue of why the personality profile of people employed in different occupations should be distinct. These would include theory concerning person-environment transactions (Roberts, Wood, & Caspi, 2008), which is closely related to the ASTMA framework, social investment theory (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007), PERSOC which concerns itself with the interplay between PERSONALITY and SOCIAL relationships (Back et al, 2011), and trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003). However, a detailed consideration of all these frameworks would not be feasible here.

²Jones, Brown, Serfass and Sherman argue that the reliabilities of the standard deviation, skew and kurtosis should be calculated from the residuals once the effects due to the mean and squared mean have been controlled for. Whether this is so or not must surely be dependent whether mean level and personality variability are measured independently.

³A test of whether completing the BFI on the night or at home biased responses found a non-significant Hotelling's T ($V = .051$, $F = 1.20$, $df_1 = 5$, $df_2 = 112$, $p = .31$), with follow up tests similarly non-significant. So no biasing effect was supported by these data.

References

- Allik, J., Church, A.T., Ortiz, F.A, Rossier, J., Hřebíčková, M., de Fruyt, F., ...McCrae, R. R. (2017). Mean profiles of the NEO personality inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*, 402-420.
- Ando, V., Claridge, G., & Clark, K. (2014). Psychotic traits in comedians. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 204*, 341-345. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.113.134569>
- Back, M. D., Baumert, A., Denissen, J. J. A., Hartung, F.-M., Penke, L., Schmukle, S. C., . . . Wrzus, C. (2011). PERSOC: A unified framework for understanding the dynamic interplay of personality and social relationships. *European Journal of Personality, 25*, 90–107. doi:10.1002/per.811
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00160>
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*, 396 – 403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00051.x>
- Bleidorn, W. (2009). Linking personality states, current social roles and major life goals. *European Journal of Personality, 23*, 509 - 530. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.731>
- Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 187-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.2.187>
- Booth, T., & Hughes, D. (2014). Exploratory Structural Equation Modelling of personality data. *Assessment, 21*, 260-271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114528029>

- 1
2
3 Bradley-Geist, J. C., & Landis, R. S. (2012). Homogeneity of personality in occupations and
4
5 organizations: A comparison of alternative statistical tests. *Journal of Business and*
6
7 *Psychology*, 27, 149–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9233-6>
8
9
10 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance.
11
12 *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14(3), 464–504.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
15
16
17 Chortle. (2019). ‘Comedians’. [Online] Available at: <http://www.chortle.co.uk/comics>.
18
19 [Accessed 2 April, 2019]
20
21 Clifton, A., & Kuper, L. E. (2011). Self-reported personality variability across the social
22
23 network is associated with interpersonal dysfunction. *Journal of Personality*, 79(2),
24
25 359–389. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00686.x>.
26
27
28 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). New York,
29
30 NY: Laurence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
31
32
33 Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory and five-factor*
34
35 *inventory professional manual*. Odessa, Fl: Psychological Assessment Resources.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1037/t03907-000>
38
39
40 Côté, S., Moskowitz, D. S., & Zuroff, D. C. (2012). Social relationships and intraindividual
41
42 variability in interpersonal behavior: Correlates of interpersonal spin. *Journal of*
43
44 *Personality and Social Psychology*. 102(3), 646–659.
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025313>
47
48
49 Del Giudice, M., Booth, T. & Irwing, P. (2012). The distance between Mars and Venus:
50
51 Measuring global sex differences in personality. *PLoS ONE* 7(1): e29265.
52
53 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029265
54
55
56 Denissen, J. J. A., Ulferts, H., Ludtke, O., Muck, P. M., & Gerstorf, D. (2014). Longitudinal
57
58 transactions between personality and occupational roles: A large and heterogeneous
59
60

- 1
2
3 study of job beginners, stayers, and changers. *Developmental Psychology*, 50, 1931-
4 1942. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036994>
5
6
7
8 DeYoung, C. G. (2014). Cybernetic Big Five theory. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 56,
9 33-58.
10
11
12 Dolan, C. V., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (1994). Testing specific hypotheses concerning latent
13 group differences in multi-group covariance structure analysis with structured means.
14 *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 29, 203-222.
15
16
17
18
19 Ericsson, K. A., & Kintsch, W. (1995). Long-term working memory. *Psychological Review*,
20 102, 211-245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.102.2.211>
21
22
23
24 Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of the impact of personality on scientific and artistic
25 creativity. *Personality and Social Psychological Review*, 2, 290–309. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0204_5)
26 10.1207/s15327957pspr0204_5
27
28
29
30
31 Finch, J. F., & West, S.G. (1997). The Investigation of Personality Structure: Statistical
32 Models. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 439-485. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2194)
33 10.1006/jrpe.1997.2194
34
35
36
37
38 Fisher, S., & Fisher, R. L. (1981). *Pretend the world is funny and forever: A psychological*
39 *analysis of comedians, clowns, and actors*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
40 Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315802947>
41
42
43
44
45 Fleeson, W. (2001). Towards a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits
46 as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80,
47 1011–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.1011>
48
49
50
51
52 Fleeson, W. (2007). Situation-based contingencies underlying trait-content manifestation in
53 behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 75, 825-862. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00458.x)
54 6494.2007.00458.x
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fleeson, W., & Gallagher, P. (2009). The implications of big five standing for the
4
5 distribution of trait manifestation in behavior: Fifteen experience-sampling Studies
6
7 and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 1097–1114.
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016786>
10
11
12 Fleeson, W., & Jayawickreme, E. (2015). Whole trait theory. *Journal of Research in*
13
14 *Personality*, *56*, 82-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.10.009>
15
16
17 Fleeson, W., & Law, M. K. (2015). Trait enactments as density distributions: The role of
18
19 actors, situations, and observers in explaining stability and variability. *Journal of*
20
21 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 1090–1104. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0039517>
22
23
24 Fournier, M. A., Moskowitz, D. S., & Zuroff, D. C. (2009). The interpersonal signature.
25
26 *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 155–162.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.023>
29
30
31 French, B. F., & Finch, W. (2006). Confirmatory factor analytic procedures for the
32
33 determination of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *13*, 378-402
34
35 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1303_3
36
37
38 Greengross, G., & Miller, G. F. (2009). The Big Five personality traits of professional
39
40 comedians compared to amateur comedians, comedy writers, and college students.
41
42 *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*, 79-83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025774>
43
44
45 Heller, D., Komar, J., & Lee, W. B. (2007). The dynamics of personality states, goals and
46
47 well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 898-910.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207301010>
50
51
52 Ho, D. E., Imai, K., King, G., & Stuart, E. A. (2011). MatchIt : Nonparametric preprocessing
53
54 for parametric causal inference. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *42(8)*.
55
56 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v042.i08>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hu, L.T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
4 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*,
5 6, 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
6
7
8
9
10 Hughes, D. J., Lee, A., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Legood, A. (2018). Leadership,
11 creativity, and innovation: A critical review and practical recommendations. *The*
12 *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 549-569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.03.001>.
13
14
15
16
17 Janus, S. S. (1975). The great comedians: Personality and other factors. *American Journal of*
18 *Psychoanalysis*, 35, 169–174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01358189>
19
20
21
22 Janus, S. S., Bess, B. E., & Janus, B. R. (1978). The great comediennes: Personality and other
23 factors. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 38, 367–372.
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01253595>
27
28
29 John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five
30 trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In L. A. Pervin & O. P.
31 John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: theory and research* 3rd ed. (pp. 114–158).
32 New York, NY: Guilford Press.
33
34
35
36
37 John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: history, measurement and
38 theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of*
39 *personality: theory and research* (pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
40
41
42
43
44 Jordan, M., Herriot, P., & Chalmers, C. (1991). Testing Schneider's ASA theory. *Applied*
45 *Psychology: An International Review*, 40, 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464->
46 [0597.1991.tb01357.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1991.tb01357.x).
47
48
49
50
51 Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2013).
52 Hierarchical representations of the Five-Factor Model of personality in predicting job
53 performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 875-925.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033901>

Kaufman, S. B., Quilty, L. C., Grazioplene, R. G., Hirsch, J. B., Gray, J. R., Peterson, J. B., &

DeYoung, C. G. (2014). Openness to experience and intellect differentially predict creative achievement in the arts and sciences. *Journal of Personality*, 84, 249-

258 DOI:10.1111/jopy.12156

King, D. D., Ott-Holland, C. J., Ryan, A. M., Huang, J. L., Wadlington, P. L., & Elizondo, F.

(2017). Personality homogeneity in organizations and occupations: Considering similarity sources. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(6), 641-653.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9459-4>

Jones, A. B., Brown, N. A., Serfass, D. G., & Sherman, R. A. (2017). *Journal of Research in*

Personality, 69, 225-236. [Doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.10.006) 0092-6566/

Lievens, F., Lang, W. B., De Fruyt, F., Corstjens, J., de Vijver, M., & Bledlow, R. (2018).

The predictive power of people's intraindividual variability across situations:

Implementing whole trait theory in assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,

103(7), 753-771. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000280>

Little, T. D. (2013). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling*. New York: Guildford press.

Lodi-Smith, J., & Roberts, B. W. (2007). Social investment and personality: A meta-analysis

of the relationship of personality traits to investment in work, family, religion, and volunteerism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 68-86.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294590>

McCabe, K. O., & Fleeson, W. (2013). What is extraversion for? Integrating trait and

motivational perspectives and identifying the purpose of extraversion. *Psychological Science*, 23(12), 1498-1505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612444904>

- 1
2
3 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). Empirical and theoretical status of the five-factor
4 model of personality traits. In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.),
5 *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment: Personality theories and*
6 *models* (Vol. 1, pp. 273–294). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7
8
9
10
11
12 Meredith, W. (1993). Measurement invariance, factor analysis and factorial invariance,
13 *Psychometrika*, 58, 525-543.
14
15
16
17 Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2015). Understanding psychopathy using the basic elements
18 of personality. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9, 223–237.
19
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12170>
22
23
24 Millsap, R. E., & Kim, H. (2018). Factorial invariance across multiple populations in discrete
25 and continuous data. In P. Irwing, T. Booth & D.J. Hughes (Eds.). (2018), *Wiley*
26 *Handbook of Psychometric Testing: A Multidisciplinary Reference on Survey, Scale*
27 *and Test Development* (pp. 849-884). London: John Wiley & Sons
28
29
30
31
32
33 Minbashian, A., Wood, R. E., & Beckmann, N. (2010). Task-contingent conscientiousness as
34 a unit of personality at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 793– 806.
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020016>
38
39
40 Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality:
41
42 Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality
43 structure. *Psychological Review*, 102(2), 246–268. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033->
44
45
46
47
48 295x.102.2.246
49
50 Nettle, D. (2006). Psychological profiles of professional actors. *Personality and Individual*
51 *Differences*, 40, 375–383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.008>
52
53
54 Paunonen, S.V., & Jackson, D. N. (2000). What Is Beyond the Big Five? Plenty!
55
56 *Journal of Personality*, 68, 821-835. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00117>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Perunovic, W. Q. E., Heller, D., Ross, M., & Komar, S. (2011). The within-person dynamics
4 of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, affective states, and cultural identification: A
5 diary study of bicultural individuals. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*,
6 2(6), 635-641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550611405071>
7
8
9
10
11
12 Ployhart, R. E., Weekley, J. A., & Baughman, K. (2006). The structure and function of
13 human capital emergence: A multilevel examination of the Attraction–Selection–
14 Attrition model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 661–677.
15
16
17
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083023>.
20
21
22 R Development Core Team. (2008). *R: A language and environment for statistical*
23 *computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Roberts, B. W. (2006). Personality development and organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1–40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-3085\(06\)27001-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-3085(06)27001-1)
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 1-25.
- Roberts, B. W., Wood, D., & Caspi, A. (2008). Personality Development. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 375–398). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. , Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70, 41-55.
- Russell, J. J., Moskowitz, D. S., Zuroff, D. C., Sookman, D., & Paris, J. (2007). Stability and variability of affective experience and interpersonal behavior in borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116, 578 –588. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843x.116.3.578>

- 1
2
3 Satterwhite, R. C., Fleenor, J. W., Braddy, P. W., Feldman, J., & Hoopes, L. (2009). A case
4
5 for homogeneity of personality at the occupational level. *International Journal of*
6
7 *Selection and Assessment*, 17, 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468->
8
9 2389.2009.00459. x.
- 10
11
12 Schaubroeck, J., Ganster, D., & Jones, J. (1998). Organization and occupation influences in
13
14 the Attraction–Selection–Attrition process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 869–
15
16 891. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.869>.
- 17
18
19 Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of
20
21 structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit
22
23 measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- 24
25
26 Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in
27
28 personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research
29
30 findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262–274. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033->
31
32 [2909.124.2.262](http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262)
- 33
34
35 Schmidt, F. L., & Oh, I. S. (2010). Can synthetic validity methods achieve discriminant
36
37 validity? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3, 344-350.
38
39 [Doi.org/10.1017/S1754942600002510](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1754942600002510)
- 40
41
42 Schmidt, F. L., Shaffer, J. A., & Oh, I. S. (2008). Increased accuracy for range restriction
43
44 corrections: Implications for the role of personality and general mental ability in job
45
46 and training performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 827– 868.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00132.x>
- 49
50
51 Sherman, R. A., Rauthmann, J. F., Brown, N. A., Serfass, D. G., Jones, A. B., & John, F.
52
53 (2015). The independent effects of personality and situations on real-time expressions
54
55 of behavior and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(5), 872-
56
57 888. [DOI.org/pspp0000036](https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000036)
- 58
59
60

1
2
3 Silvia, P. J., Kaufman, J. C., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Wigert, B. (2011). Cantakerous creativity,
4
5 Honesty-humility, agreeableness, and the HEXACO structure of creative
6
7 achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*, 687-689.

8
9
10 Doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.011

11
12 Southwick, S. M., M. Vythilingam, & Charney, D. S. (2005). The psychobiology of
13
14 depression and resilience to stress: Implications for prevention and treatment. *Annual*
15
16 *Review of Clinical Psychology* *1*, 255-291.

17
18
19 [DOI.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.1.102803.143948](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.1.102803.143948)

20
21 Sutin, A. R., & Costa, P. (2010). Reciprocal influences of personality and job characteristics
22
23 across middle adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, *78*(1), 257-288. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00615.x)
24
25 [10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00615.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00615.x)

26
27 Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job
28
29 performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 500-517. DOI: 10.1037/0021-
30
31 9010.88.3.500

32
33
34
35 Thorson, J.A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Sense of humor and dimensions of personality.
36
37 *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *49*, 799-809.

38
39
40 Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of
41
42 psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain. In K. J. Bryant,
43
44 M. Windle, & S. G. West (Eds.), *The science of prevention: Methodological advances*
45
46 *from alcohol and substance abuse research* (pp. 281–324). Washington, DC:
47
48 American Psychological Association.

49
50
51 Woods, S. A., Wille, B., Wu, C. H., Lievens, F., & de Fruyt, F. (2019). The influence of work
52
53 on personality trait development: The demands-affordances Transactional (DATA)
54
55 model, an integrative review and research agenda; *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,
56
57 *110*, 258-271. DOI.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.11.010

1
2
3 Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active
4 crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179-201. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011)
5
6
7
8 10.5465/amr.2001.4378011
9

10 Wrzus, C., & Roberts, B. W. (2017). Processes of personality and development in adulthood:
11 The TESSERA framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21, 253–277.
12
13
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316652279>
16

17 Zeigler-Hill, V., Li, H., Masri, J., Smith, A., Vonk, J., Madson, M. B., & Zhang, Q. (2013).
18 Self-esteem instability and academic outcomes in American and Chinese college
19 students. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47, 455–463.
20
21
22
23
24 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.03.010>
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1.

Tests of invariance between the respective norm groups, and the samples of professional and amateur comedians.

Model	X ²	df	CFI	ΔCFI	RMSEA	ΔRMSEA	TLI
Professional							
Configural	146240.2	1515	.934		.039		.918
Metric	62347.1	1710	.972	..038	.024	-.015	.969
Scalar	60422.8	1794	.973	..001	.023	-.001	.972
Amateur							
Configural	277994.4	1515	.916		.044		.895
Metric	112181.8	1710	.967	.051	.026	-.018	.963
Scalar	107401.3	1794	.968	.001	.025	-.001	.966

Table 2.

Mean Cohen's d-scores on the Big Five Inventory for amateur and professional comedians in comparison to their respective norm samples.

Personality factor	Norm group ¹	Amateurs	Professionals
Neuroticism	0	.09[-.10, .27]	.47[.23, .71]
Extraversion	0	.51[.32, .69]	.28[.07, .48]
Openness-to-experience	0	.54[.34, .75]	.59[.25, .93]
Agreeableness	0	.07[-.14, .26]	.12[-.13, .37]
Conscientiousness	0	-.26[-.46, -.06]	-.38[-.61, -.14]

¹When means are estimated from a scalar invariant SEM analyses the means of one group must be set at 0 for the model to be identified. Ninety-five per cent confidence intervals are shown in brackets, and mean differences significant at the .05 level are shown in bold.

Table 3.

Mean scores on the ten comedy relevant facets of personality: Optimum scores and the expert ratings of amateur and professional comedians in performance, with and without age as a covariate.

	Optimum	No Covariate		Age Covariate	
		Amateur	Prof	Amateur	Prof
Neuroticism					
1. Angry hostility	3.63	4.00	4.12	4.08	4.01
		[3.71, 4.30]	[3.75, 4.49]	[3.78, 4.38]	[3.62, 4.39]
2. Self-consciousness	2.61	4.54	3.25	4.46	3.38
		[4.20, 4.87]	[2.84, 3.68]	[4.11, 4.81]	[2.93, 3.82]
3. Anxiety	3.04	5.33	3.79	5.30	3.83
		[4.98, 5.68]	[3.35, 4.22]	[4.93, 5.66]	[3.37, 4.30]
4. Impulsiveness	3.42	5.75	5.26	5.75	5.27
		[5.37, 4.66]	[4.79, 5.73]	[5.36, 6.13]	[4.78, 5.76]
Extraversion					
5. Assertiveness	7.58	5.57	7.17	5.76	6.84
		[5.20, 5.95]	[6.70, 7.63]	[5.40, 6.12]	[6.37, 7.30]
Openness					
6. Intellectual Curiosity	7.56	4.32	5.68	4.32	5.74
		[3.99, 4.65]	[5.28, 6.09]	[4.00, 4.65]	[5.32, 6.16]
Agreeableness					
7. Straightforwardness	4.50	5.83	5.38	5.73	5.49
		[5.53, 6.13]	[5.02, 5.75]	[5.44, 6.03]	[5.11, 5.87]
8. Compliance	4.66	5.84	4.78	5.62	5.18
		[5.46, 6.23]	[4.30, 5.25]	[5.25, 5.99]	[4.70, 5.65]
Conscientiousness					
9. Self-discipline	7.01	6.55	6.75	6.63	6.66
		[6.19, 6.90]	[6.32, 7.19]	[6.28, 6.98]	[6.21, 7.11]
10. Deliberation	4.59	6.15	5.28	6.06	5.43
		[5.79, 6.51]	[4.84, 5.73]	[5.71, 6.42]	[4.97, 5.89]

Note: All scores are on a scale from 1-10. Amateur N = 112, Prof. N = 71. Ninety-five per cent confidence intervals are in brackets. Mean differences between professional and amateur comedians significant at the 95% level are shown in bold.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary Materials

Comedians' mean level and stage personalities by Irwing, Cook, Pollet, & Hughes, 2019,

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin

Section 1

Table 1. Pattern matrix for the unstandardized scalar equivalent solution, McDonald's Omega and average variance extracted: Professional comedians and the comparison sample

Item	Factor				
	Extraversion	Neuroticism	Conscientiousness	Openness	Agreeableness
Is talkative	.81	.21	-.05	.03	.06
Is reserved	.76	.00	-.08	-.12	-.01
Is full of energy	.46	-.14	.23	.19	.08
Generates a lot of enthusiasm	.57	.00	.15	.29	.14
Tends to be quiet	.90	.06	-.05	-.14	-.04
Has an assertive personality	.53	-.09	.22	.19	-.26
Is sometimes shy, inhibited	.71	-.17	.04	-.16	-.09
Is outgoing, sociable	.75	.00	-.02	.07	.18
Is depressed, blue	-.26	.53	-.09	.06	-.11
Is relaxed, handles stress well	.04	.79	.02	-.20	-.02
Can be tense	-.04	.72	.14	.05	-.15
Worries a lot	-.08	.79	.07	.00	.10
Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	.02	.70	-.03	-.12	-.05
Can be moody	-.08	.50	.01	.11	-.34
Remains calm in tense situations	.06	.63	-.11	-.28	-.03
Gets nervous easily	-.27	.56	-.06	-.05	.14
Does a thorough job	-.01	.09	.77	.07	-.01
Can be somewhat careless	-.09	-.10	.55	-.16	.07
Is a reliable worker	.03	.07	.69	-.02	.16
Tends to be disorganized	.00	-.01	.70	-.22	-.05
Tends to be lazy	.16	-.02	.63	-.13	.06
Perseveres until the task is finished	.00	.02	.70	.12	.01
Does things efficiently	.01	-.03	.70	.09	.02
Makes plans and follows through	.13	-.02	.62	.05	-.03
Is easily distracted	-.08	-.19	.57	-.14	-.02
Is original, comes up with new ideas	.11	-.15	.04	.71	-.12
Is curious about many different things	.07	-.05	-.02	.60	.01
Is ingenious, a deep thinker	-.14	.04	.09	.63	-.08
Has an active imagination	-.08	.10	-.11	.64	.00
Is inventive	.05	-.19	.04	.75	-.12
Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	-.03	.13	-.08	.66	.16
Prefers work that is routine	.14	-.16	-.15	.30	-.09
Likes to reflect, play with ideas	-.09	-.02	.01	.67	.03
Has few artistic interests	-.03	.04	-.09	.42	.07
Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature	-.04	.07	-.10	.60	.07
Tends to find fault with others	-.07	-.26	-.08	-.03	.50
Is helpful and unselfish with others	.04	.03	.13	.16	.57
Starts quarrels with others	-.26	-.25	.03	-.01	.57
Has a forgiving nature	.03	-.10	-.14	.16	.60
Is generally trusting	.09	-.02	.01	.05	.30
Can be cold and aloof	.31	-.04	-.02	-.17	.53
Is considerate and kind to almost everyone	.01	.07	.07	.16	.75
Is sometimes rude to others	-.16	-.14	.08	-.08	.63
Likes to cooperate with others	.21	.03	.11	.06	.51
Professional comedians					
Average Variance Extracted	.42	.42	.36	.36	.28
McDonald's Omega	.84	.85	.83	.84	.78
Comparison sample					
Average Variance Extracted	.49	.43	.44	.37	.31
McDonald's Omega	.88	.86	.88	.85	.78

Table 2.

Pattern matrix for the unstandardized scalar equivalent solution, McDonald's Omega and average variance extracted: Amateur comedians and the comparison sample

Item	Factor				
	Extraversion	Neuroticism	Conscientiousness	Openness	Agreeableness
Is talkative	.82	.19	-.05	.02	.06
Is reserved	.73	.00	-.08	-.13	.00
Is full of energy	.48	-.14	.19	.17	.10
Generates a lot of enthusiasm	.58	.00	.13	.28	.16
Tends to be quiet	.90	.05	-.05	-.14	-.05
Has an assertive personality	.52	-.09	.22	.19	-.25
Is sometimes shy, inhibited	.71	-.18	.05	-.16	-.09
Is outgoing, sociable	.76	-.01	-.03	.06	.17
Is depressed, blue	-.27	.51	-.08	.08	-.13
Is relaxed, handles stress well	.04	.80	.04	-.22	-.03
Can be tense	-.05	.69	.14	.05	-.18
Worries a lot	-.09	.79	.07	.00	.09
Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	.01	.69	-.02	-.12	-.04
Can be moody	-.04	.50	.00	.10	-.35
Remains calm in tense situations	.07	.63	-.10	-.30	-.03
Gets nervous easily	-.27	.57	-.06	-.05	.13
Does a thorough job	.00	.08	.77	.08	-.01
Can be somewhat careless	-.08	-.09	.55	-.15	.09
Is a reliable worker	.04	.09	.71	.00	.15
Tends to be disorganized	-.00	.00	.72	-.22	-.04
Tends to be lazy	.15	-.01	.64	-.13	.06
Perseveres until the task is finished	.00	.02	.69	.13	.01
Does things efficiently	.01	-.04	.69	.11	.02
Makes plans and follows through	.14	-.02	.59	.05	-.03
Is easily distracted	-.10	-.18	.59	-.12	-.02
Is original, comes up with new ideas	.11	-.16	.03	.71	-.10
Is curious about many different things	.06	-.04	-.02	.60	.01
Is ingenious, a deep thinker	-.15	.04	.09	.62	-.08
Has an active imagination	.08	.10	-.13	.64	.00
Is inventive	.05	-.21	.04	.74	-.10
Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	-.03	.13	-.06	.64	.14
Prefers work that is routine	.12	-.14	-.14	.28	-.07
Likes to reflect, play with ideas	-.09	-.02	.01	.67	.03
Has few artistic interests	-.02	.04	-.07	.38	.05
Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature	-.04	.07	-.09	.60	.06
Tends to find fault with others	-.06	-.22	-.08	-.05	.51
Is helpful and unselfish with others	.34	.05	.12	.16	.59
Starts quarrels with others	-.26	-.21	.04	.00	.57
Has a forgiving nature	.02	-.08	-.15	.17	.61
Is generally trusting	.10	-.01	.00	.06	.51
Can be cold and aloof	.29	-.04	-.02	-.17	.55
Is considerate and kind to almost everyone	.01	.09	.05	.17	.77
Is sometimes rude to others	-.17	-.11	.11	-.08	.64
Likes to cooperate with others	.23	.04	.09	.07	.51
Amateur comedians					
Average Variance Extracted	.48	.43	.47	.42	.28
McDonald's Omega	.87	.85	.89	.87	.78
Comparison sample					
Average Variance Extracted	.49	.43	.44	.36	.35
McDonald's Omega	.88	.85	.88	.78	.82

Section 2

Multivariate analysis of covariance using multiple imputation.

The multivariate analysis of variance/covariance with multiple imputation, reported on page 19 of the results, used 20 imputed data sets as recommended by Schafer and Graham (2002). However, the analysis was complicated by the fact that SPSS version 23.0 does not provide pooled results for the 20 data sets. In consequence, we report those results for the data set which resulted in the median score for Pillai's trace. We compared this set of results for those data sets with the highest and lowest Pillai's trace. There was no material difference.

Reference

Schafer, J. L., & Graham, J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 147-177.

Section 3

Stimulus materials

1) Online questionnaire instructions – presented for collection of biographical data and trait (FFM) personality data*

This questionnaire has a number of sections, which are designed to allow you to indicate how you see yourself and your behaviour and the experiences you have.

Please answer as openly and honestly as you can. It is important that you do not try to give what you think may be a correct answer. Instead, please indicate what is correct for you.

Your individual responses will not be shared with anyone. You are being asked to give your name but this is only to allow questionnaires to be matched up. Your name will be removed before any analysis is undertaken and will not be written in any report or publication. Your responses are confidential.

Biographical Details

What is your name? (please type in the box below - Your name will be removed before any analysis is undertaken and will not be written in any report or publication.)

What is your gender?

Male/ Female

What is your date of birth? (please type in the box below using the dd/mm/yyyy format)

What is your highest level of education?

1
2
3 *Secondary school education to age 16 / Secondary school education to age 18 / Non-*
4 *university higher education / Undergraduate university education / Postgraduate university*
5 *education*
6
7
8
9

10 *Trait Personality*
11

12 Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you
13 agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please select the appropriate
14 response to indicate your level of agreement with each statement.
15
16

17 I see myself as someone who:

18
19 Is talkative

20
21 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
22

23 Tends to find fault with others

24
25 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
26
27

28
29 Does a thorough job

30
31 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
32
33

34 Is depressed, blue

35
36 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
37
38

39 Is original, comes up with new ideas

40
41 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
42
43

44 Is reserved

45
46 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
47
48

49 Is helpful and unselfish with others

50
51 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
52
53

54 Can be somewhat careless

55
56 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
57
58

59 Is relaxed, handles stress well

60
Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree

1
2
3 Is curious about many different things
4

5 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
6

7 Is full of energy
8

9 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
10

11 Starts quarrels with others
12

13 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
14

15 Is a reliable worker
16

17 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
18

19 Is ingenious, a deep thinker
20

21 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
22

23 Can be tense
24

25 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
26

27 Generates a lot of enthusiasm
28

29 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
30

31 Has a forgiving nature
32

33 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
34

35 Tends to be disorganized
36

37 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
38

39 Worries a lot
40

41 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
42

43 Has an active imagination
44

45 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
46

47 Tends to be quiet
48

49 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
50

51 Is generally trusting
52

53 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
54

55 Tends to be lazy
56

1
2
3 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

4
5 Is emotionally stable, not easily upset

6
7 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

8
9 Is inventive

10
11 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

12
13 Has an assertive personality

14
15 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

16
17 Can be cold and aloof

18
19 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

20
21 Perseveres until the task is finished

22
23 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

24
25 Can be moody

26
27 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

28
29 Values artistic, aesthetic experiences

30
31 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

32
33 Is sometimes shy, inhibited

34
35 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

36
37 Is considerate and kind to almost everyone

38
39 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

40
41 Does things efficiently

42
43 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

44
45 Remains calm in tense situations

46
47 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

48
49 Prefers work that is routine

50
51 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

52
53 Is outgoing, sociable

54
55 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*

1
2
3 Is sometimes rude to others
4

5 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
6

7 Makes plans and follows through with them
8

9 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
10

11 Gets nervous easily
12

13 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
14

15 Likes to reflect, play with ideas
16

17 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
18

19 Has few artistic interests
20

21 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
22

23 Likes to cooperate with others
24

25 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
26

27 Is easily distracted
28

29 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
30

31 Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature
32

33 *Strongly disagree/disagree a little/Neither agree not disagree/Agree a little/ Strongly agree*
34

35
36
37
38
39
40 *The online questionnaire also included questions not analysed in the current study which are
41 therefore not included in this document.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2a) Expert interviews – for identification of comedy relevant facets of personality

Instructions

(delivered once ethical issues - anonymity, use of data, data destruction, consent and right to withdraw - had been covered.)

I am now going to read out a list of personality characteristics to you one by one. In response to each, I am going to ask you to indicate:

if it would be observable when comedians perform;

if it impacts on how effective a comedian would be during their performance; and

if it is something a comedian would need to vary (that is, show different levels of it) in different performances in order to have a successful show.

A simple yes or no response would be useful in response to each of these questions. Are you happy to proceed?

Descriptions of the facets were read directly out of the Revised NEO-PIR technical manual (Costa & McCrae, 1992). After each one had been read out, respondents were asked the following three questions:

Would you be able to observe this in a comedian when they perform?

Would a comedian's level of this have an impact on how effective their performance was?

Would a comedian need to vary this across different performances?

2b) Expert survey – for identification of comedy relevant facets of personality⁺

This questionnaire will ask you, as an industry expert, your opinion on a number of issues relating to the performance and success of comedians. Please answer all questions as openly and honestly as possible. Your responses will be treated with the strictest of confidence, your name will not be attached to any comments that you make and certainly will not be shared with anyone not involved in this study. You can choose not to give your name (below) if you prefer.

What is your name? (Please type 'anonymous' or 'not given' if you prefer not to give your name)

How would you describe your role in the industry? (select as many as appropriate)

1
2
3 *Reviewer/ Comedian/ Agent/ Comedy club employee/ Promoter/ Television producer/ Radio*
4 *producer/ Other*
5

6
7 If you selected 'other' please specify below
8

9 Below is a list of personality characteristics which an individual may show to varying degrees
10 (e.g. they may show high, low or mid levels of each characteristic). Please indicate the extent
11 to which you think each one is something that a comedian would need to vary according to
12 where they were performing or who they were performing to.
13

	To a great extent				Not at all
	1	2	3	4	5
Angry-hostility: An individual's readiness to experience anger and related states such as frustration and bitterness	1	2	3	4	5
Self consciousness: This how uncomfortable an individual is around others, their sensitivity to ridicule, proneness to feelings of inferiority and the extent to which they are disturbed by awkward social situations.	1	2	3	4	5
Assertiveness: Assertive people are dominant, forceful and socially ascendant.	1	2	3	4	5
Gregariousness: This is how great a preference individuals have for other people's company.	1	2	3	4	5
Ideas: This describes a person's level of open mindedness, willingness to consider new or unconventional ideas and if they take an active pursuit of intellectual interests.	1	2	3	4	5
Straightforwardness: This refers to how frank, ingenuous and sincere individuals are or, on the other hand, if they are willing to be more manipulative of people	1	2	3	4	5
Compliance: This is how willing an individual is to defer to others, to inhibit aggression, to forgive and forget and how meek and mild they are	1	2	3	4	5

Self-discipline: This describes and individual's ability to carry tasks through to completion despite boredom or other distractions	1	2	3	4	5
Deliberation: This is a tendency to think carefully before reacting. It describes how hasty individuals are and if they speak without thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
Anxiety: This is how apprehensive, fearful, prone to worry, nervous, tense and jittery a person is.	1	2	3	4	5
Impulsiveness: This is an individual's ability to control cravings and urges and to resist desires they may later regret.	1	2	3	4	5
Fantasy: This describes how vivid an individuals' imagination is and if they have an active fantasy life e.g. if they daydream for its own sake or if they keep their mind on the task in hand.	1	2	3	4	5

+The expert survey also included questions not analysed in the current study which are therefore not included in this document.

3) Behavioural ratings - for collection of required and expressed personality state data

Below are ten aspects of personality. The high and low end of each is described and individuals may fall anywhere along the 10 point scale, depending on how accurate either description is of them.

1) Please select the number which best reflects how the person you are rating needed to be to do the best that they possibly could have when they were on stage.

2) Then select the number which best represents how the person you are rating actually was when they were on stage - as far as you can tell.

Please base your ratings of the person on how they were in the recordings not how you may know them to be at other times.

1a. How they needed to be

Easy going and slow to anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Appears ready to experience anger, or related states e.g. frustration, bitterness

1b. How they were

Easy going and slow to anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Appears ready to experience anger, or related states e.g. frustration, bitterness

2a. How they needed to be

Comfortable regardless of the awkwardness of the situation, not easily embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Uncomfortable in awkward situations, sensitive to ridicule,

2b. How they were

Comfortable regardless of the awkwardness of the situation, not easily embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Uncomfortable in awkward situations, sensitive to ridicule,

3a. How they needed to be

Unassertive, keeps in the background, lets others do the talking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Dominant, forceful and socially ascendant.

3b. How they were

Unassertive, keeps in the background, lets others do the talking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Dominant, forceful and socially ascendant.

4a. How they needed to be

Narrowly focuses on a limited number of topics, less willing to consider unconventional ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Open minded, considers new or unconventional ideas, pursues intellectual interests.

4b. How they were

Narrowly focuses on a limited number of topics, less willing to consider unconventional ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Open minded, considers new or unconventional ideas, pursues intellectual interests.

5a. How they needed to be

Willing to use flattery, craftiness, deception or to hide their true feelings to gain their desired outcome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Frank, ingenuous and sincere

5b. How they were

Willing to use flattery, craftiness, deception or to hide their true feelings to gain their desired outcome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Frank, ingenuous and sincere

6a. How they needed to be

Aggressive, prefers to compete than cooperate, willing to express anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Meek and mild. willing to inhibit aggression and to forgive and forget.

6b. How they were

Aggressive, prefers to compete than cooperate, willing to express anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Meek and mild. willing to inhibit aggression and to forgive and forget.

7a. How they needed to be

Casual about the performance, procrastinates, easily distracted, discouraged or willing to quit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Focuses on the performance, not easily distracted from their material.

7b. How they were

Casual about the performance, procrastinates, easily distracted, discouraged or willing to quit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Focuses on the performance, not easily distracted from their material.

8a. How they needed to be

Spontaneous, able to make snap decisions, hasty, may speak without considering the consequences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Thinks carefully before reacting, cautious and deliberate

8b. How they were

Spontaneous, able to make snap decisions, hasty, may speak without considering the consequences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Thinks carefully before reacting, cautious and deliberate

9a. How they needed to be

Calm, relaxed, does not dwell on things that might go wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Apprehensive, fearful, nervous, tense & jittery

9b. How they were

Calm, relaxed, does not dwell on things that might go wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Apprehensive, fearful, nervous, tense & jittery

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

10a. How they needed to be

Does not control cravings and urges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Controls cravings and urges, resists desires
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---

10b. How they were

Does not control cravings and urges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Controls cravings and urges, resists desires
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---