Personality and Physician-Assessed Illness Burden in Older Primary Care Patients Over 4 Years

Benjamin P. Chapman, Ph.D., M.P.H., Brent Roberts, Ph.D., Jeff Lyness, M.D., Paul Duberstein, Ph.D.

Background: *Personality traits have been associated with physician-rated illness burden cross-sectionally, but longitudinal associations between personality and objective medical morbidity remain unclear.* **Purpose:** *To examine associations between personality and physician-rated illness burden 4 years prospectively in older primary care patients.* **Method:** *At baseline, patients (average age: 75, SD: 6.6, 62% female) completed the NEO-Five Factor Inventory. At baseline and 4 yearly follow-ups, a physician completed the Cumulative Illness Rating Scale on the basis of medical records.* **Results:** *Linear mixed-effects models revealed that higher neuroticism and lower conscientiousness predicted worse average illness burden longitudinally. Relatively disagreeable persons (25th percentile) accumulated morbidity at a 33% faster rate than agreeable (75th percentile) peers. At the final follow-up, a person at the 75th percentile of neuroticism and the 25th percentile of conscientiousness and agreeableness showed morbidity comparable to a peer of average personality but 10 years older. An individual at the 25th percentile of neuroticism and 75th percentile of conscientiousness and agreeableness showed end-point illness burden comparable to a peer of average personality but 10 years younger. Twenty-one percent of the morbidity associated with neuroticism was explained by total cholesterol. History of hypertension, smoking, alcohol/drug abuse, and affective symptoms of depression each explained 10% or less of the other observed personality effects.* **Conclusion:** *Personality plays a nontrivial role in healthy aging among older persons. Brief personality assessment may identify at-risk older persons for closer monitoring, enhance the accuracy of medical prognosis, and provide clues for clinical interventions to promote better health.* (Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2012; 00:1–10)

Key Words: Cohort study, medical illness, older persons, personality traits, primary care

Personality traits have been linked with both self-rated health[1,2] and mortality.[3] Whereas mortality is perhaps the most objective indicator of overall health, patients' self-reports more accurately capture subjective health;.[4,5] yet less is known about how personality phenotype is linked to objective health, while patients are still alive. Clarifying such associations can provide clues about the importance of personality for objective disease before final end-points like mortality, when health and quality of life can be potentially impacted.

There are at least three theoretical mechanisms through which personality may operate to influence objective disease load.[6,7] First, personality traits are strongly associated with health behaviors such as smoking, diet, and exercise.[8] Second, personality is associated with individual differences in psychophysiologic processes relevant to health such as immune function,[9] HPA axis function, and autonomic reactivity.[10] Finally, personality is associated with social and interpersonal factors[11] that influence health.[12] Any or all of these mechanisms operating over the lifespan, as well as novel pathways not yet known, could explain why people with particular personality traits tend to have lower levels of aggregate morbidity in old age.

The only report of which we are aware documenting associations between personality and aggregate illness burden assessed by a physician based on chart review was cross-sectional.[13] The study used the comprehensive Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality,[14,15] which organizes specific personality traits along five general axes of human dispositional variation: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. Older persons who were more conscientious, and in particular those who maintained more orderly lives, appeared to have lower levels of illness burden. However, the temporal relationship between personality and medical morbidity remains ambiguous. For instance, the extent to which health changes influence personality is unknown. In this article, we address limitations inherent in that cross-sectional work with prospective analyses. Specifically, we examine whether personality traits predict illness burden over 4 years of follow-up, in the cohort on whom our original cross-sectional report was based.

We hypothesized that conscientiousness measured at baseline would be associated with better physician-assessed health prospectively. However, neuroticism is prospectively associated with a range of health outcomes in addition to subjective health.[16] In light of this, it may also be associated with illness burden prospectively. Although some evidence exists for effects of the other FFM traits—extraversion, openness to experience, and agreeableness—their precise relationship to general medical morbidity is unknown. We, therefore, examined their effects but did not provide a priori hypotheses.

METHODS

Participants and Design

Our sample consisted of the baseline cohort described in our initial report,[13] followed for up to 4 years. The study itself was a naturalistic cohort study, intended to examine the interrelationships between mental and physical health in primary care patients older than 65 years. All patients age 65 and older who appeared on designated sampling days at internal and family-medicine offices were approached about enrollment. Eligibility requirements included being a patient at the designated primary care practice, age 65 or older, and ability to provide informed consent. More than half (50.1%) of approached individuals met eligibility and consented to participate. Enrolled subjects did not significantly differ from nonenrolled patients in age, gender, or 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale score. Subsequent to consent, patients underwent interviews with trained research assistants in their homes or at the University of Rochester Medical Center. All individuals had Medicare insurance.

The study funding was for 5 years, and intakes were staggered over the first 4 years of that period. Thus, in addition to a baseline assessment, each patient was eligible for 1–4 yearly follow-ups (up to five total assessments). Data were collected from April 2001 to April 2006. The number of assessments for each participant was dependent on entry into the study and ranged from baseline only (i.e., no follow-up) to 4 years of follow-up after baseline (i.e., a total observation period of 4 years; details are provided later). The final cohort thus involved diminishing numbers at each successive follow-up due not only to dropout or death, but

because some persons entered the study at a later date and were not eligible for later follow-ups. The study was designed to employ longitudinal analytic methods taking this pattern into account (see later). The study was approved by the local institutional review board.

Instruments

NEO-Five Factor Inventory. The NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI)[19] is a 60-item personality inventory designed to assess the Big 5 personality dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Each domain consists of subcomponents representing more specific traits: depression, anxiety, and self-reproach (neuroticism); positive affect, sociability, and activity (extraversion); aesthetic interests, intellectual interests, and unconventionality (openness); prosocial orientation and nonantagonistic orientation (agreeableness); and orderliness, goal-striving, and dependability (conscientiousness).[20,21] Following the baseline interview, participants were asked to return the completed NEO-FFI by mail. The factor structure in the sample corresponded to that intended for the instrument.[19] To remove random measurement error from the Big 5 scales and hence improve reliability, factor scores were extracted from the NEO-FFI item correlation matrix via principal axis factoring with orthogonal rotation. To scale these scores so that a 1-unit change reflected a meaningful difference in the trait, we scaled score by the interquartile range.[22] Thus, a 1-unit change in the variable corresponds to the difference in the outcome (i.e., illness burden) for a person at the 75th versus 25th level of the Big 5 trait. Note that this is not achieved through categorization, but rather through a linear transformation of the continuous variable. Thus, no information is lost and a 1-unit change in the variables corresponds to the familiar public health/clinical medicine comparison of the top versus bottom quartile of the distribution.[22]

Cumulative Illness Rating Scale. The Cumulative Illness Rating Scale (CIRS) is one of the longest-standing comorbidity indices in use.[23] It has been validated for use with primary care patients,[24] converges with coroner's pathology reports,[25] and is a strong predictor of health-related quality of life[26] and survival.[27-29] The CIRS quantifies the level of over-

all medical burden through ratings of disease severity (0 = no burden, 1 = mild burden, 2 = moderate burden, 3 = major burden, 4 = severe burden) across the following major organ systems: cardiovascular/respiratory (combining cardiac, vascular, upper respiratory, and eyes ears nose and throat items), genitourinary, musculoskeletal, neurologic, gastrointestinal (combining upper and lower gastrointestinal and hepatic items), and endocrine/metabolic. CIRS ratings were made by a physician who was blind to the data on personality. These ratings were based on the information taken from the participants' primary care charts including history, physical examinations, laboratory tests, and other health-relevant information. The physician rating the CIRS was familiar with the patient through consensus conference discussions with interviewers but had not met the patient. CIRS ratings were all made in a medical center conference room based only on abstracted chart data. The physician had no knowledge of the patient's personality scores.

Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. The 24-item version of the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS)[30] is a reliable and validated interviewer-administered measure of depressive symptom severity within the previous week that has been used with older adults in primary care. As in prior work,[13] we examined whether the affective portion of the scale measured at each wave explained any effect observed for neuroticism, in order to separate dispositional from situational negative affect.

Other Covariates. Demographic covariates included age at baseline, gender, and years of education. We also examined the effect of controlling for the set of health factors used in the prior report: history of hypertension at baseline (based on medical chart review); fasting cholesterol at each measurement point (medical chart records); current and previous smoking (self-report, corroborated by chart review); and lifetime history of alcohol or substance abuse or dependence (assessed by the Structured Clinical Interview for the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*[31] and corroborated by chart review).

Analysis

We implemented linear mixed-effects models[32] to examine the effects of baseline personality on

repeated CIRS measurements over the study period. We included nonlinear terms for time to build a more flexible model that did not assume that change over time was linear, but instead could accommodate any reasonable trajectory of illness burden over the study period. Because linearity is an unnecessary statistical assumption that may not be met in the accumulation of age-related medical burden, we considered this more flexible approach more clinical meaningful. The examination of whether Big 5 traits affected patterns of change over time involved testing interaction terms between each Big 5 factor and time terms, and retaining those that were significant in the final model. This approach reflected an examination of not just whether a trait was, on average, associated with higher medical burden over the follow-up period (i.e., trait main effects), but also an examination of whether certain traits were associated with more precipitous rates of decline (i.e., the interaction terms with time). Both kinds of longitudinal effects would appear to have clinical and public health implications in aging cohorts.

We began with a model, including all FFM factors and age, gender, and education to test the effect of each trait on average levels of CIRS over the 5-year period. Next, we examined whether any of the FFM traits were associated with steeper rates of health decline by interacting the trait with the time terms (including higher-order polynomials). To assess whether other covariates explained personality effects on either average levels of morbidity or rate of health decline over follow-up, we covaried them one by one and examined the amount of change observed in parameter estimates for personality[34] for each covariate separately and then together as a block. When an FFM dimension was significant, we substituted its components one at a time to determine which specific aspect was driving the effect.[17-18]

We also conducted multinomial logit analyses predicting dropout, death, and missed interview at each time period among those eligible for follow-up to determine whether data were Missing Completely at Random (MCAR; i.e., not predictable from prior observed covariates) or Missing at Random (MAR; i.e., predictable from prior observed covariates). Mixed-effect models yield unbiased parameter estimates under MAR,[33] whereas more restrictive analytic methods generally require data to be MCAR.

RESULTS

Sample Characterization

Data were unavailable on illness burden in 2 of 749 individuals at baseline (Wave 1). Numbers at each follow-up assessment in this 5-year study were a function of 1) deaths, 2) attrition, and 3) eligibility at each year. Eligibility for further follow-up varied with the year of study entry. For instance, a patient entering the study at Year 3 of the funding period would be eligible for only two follow-up interviews (in years 4 and 5). Because the funding did not extend beyond 5 years, however, this patient would not be eligible for 3- or 4-year follow-up assessments.

Deaths (n = 28) and withdrawals (n = 85) precluded follow-up on some of the cohort. Several others were ineligible for follow-up, given their date of study entry. Twelve-month postbaseline (Wave 2) follow-up interviews were completed on 484 of 699 (69%) eligible; 24-month (Wave 3) follow-up interviews were completed on 398 of 578 (69%) eligible; 36-month (Wave 4) follow-up interviews were completed on 313 of 418 (75%) eligible; and 48-month (Wave 5) follow-up interviews completed on 67 of 83 (81%) eligible. Multinomial logit models predicting death, withdrawal, or missing status at each time point against a reference category of completed interview from baseline characteristics revealed that older age decreased the probability of withdrawal at 1-year follow-up, greater baseline illness burden increased risk of death at 2- and 3-year follow-up and risk of missed interview at 2 years, and that higher education was associated with lower risk of termination by 2 years. The association of dropout with observed factors indicated that the data met MAR assumptions, necessitating the use of mixed models rather than other approaches relying on the more restrictive MCAR assumption.

Of interviewed persons at baseline, the return rate for personality questionnaires was 69%. Thus, the final analysis sample included 497 individuals at baseline, 364 at 12-month follow-up, 301 at 24-month follow-up, 250 at 36-month follow-up, and 54 at 48-month follow-up. Multivariate logit models indicated that this final analysis sample did not differ in terms of age or illness burden from those lacking data on at least one variable. Table 1 However, these persons were more likely to be women and had roughly one

TABLE 1. Sample Characteristics

	Mean / N	SD /%
Baseline characteristics		
Age, years	75	6.6
Male	188	38%
Female	309	62%
Education, years	14.3	2.4
Neuroticism	44.8	10
Extraversion	51.3	10
Openness	49.9	9.8
Agreeableness	54.6	9.6
Conscientiousness	49.5	9.9
No history of alcohol/substance abuse/dependence		
Never smoker	294	39%
Current smoker	65	9%
Former smoker	390	52%
Normal tensive history	138	28%
History of hypertension	359	72%
Time-varying characteristics		
HDRS affective symptoms		
Wave 1 (Baseline)	2.8	3.8
Wave 2 (12-month follow-up)	2.6	3.3
Wave 3 (24-month follow-up)	2.2	2.9
Wave 4 (36-month follow-up)	2.4	3.1
Wave 5 (48-month follow-up)	2.5	2.8
Fasting cholesterol		
Wave 1 (Baseline)	195.0	36.4
Wave 2 (12-month follow-up)	190.3	36.4
Wave 3 (24-month follow-up)	186.4	38.9
Wave 4 (36-month follow-up)	180.7	39.2
Wave 5 (48-month follow-up)	183.7	39.8
Cumulative Illness Rating Scale		
Wave 1 (Baseline)	7.4	2.9
Wave 2 (12-month follow-up)	8.6	3.1
Wave 3 (24-month follow-up)	9.3	3
Wave 4 (36-month follow-up)	9.9	3.2
Wave 5 (48-month follow-up)	11	2.6

Note: HDRS: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale.

TABLE 2. Prospective Associations Between Personality and A) Average Levels of Illness Burden Over Time, and B) Rate of Illness Burden Accumulation Over Time

	Hypothesis Tested	
Predictor	Personality Predicts *Average Levels* of Illness Burden Over Follow-up	Personality Predicts *Rate of Illness Burden Accumulation* Over Follow-up
Fixed effects		
Neuroticism	0.62[a] (0.16)	0.63[a] (0.16)
Extraversion	−0.16 (0.16)	−0.16 (0.17)
Openness	−0.06 (0.18)	−0.06 (0.18)
Agreeableness	−0.13 (0.18)	0.03 (0.19)
Conscientiousness	−0.43[b] (0.16)	−0.44[b] (0.16)
Time: Years	1.28[a] (0.06)	1.37[a] (0.07)
Time: Years ^{2}	−0.11[c] (0.05)	−0.11[c] (0.05)
Time: Years ^{3}	0.06 (0.03)	0.06[c] (0.03)
Baseline age (Years)	0.13[a] (0.02)	0.13[a] (0.02)
Education, years	−0.07 (0.06)	−0.07 (0.06)
Female gender	−0.48 (0.28)	−0.49 (0.28)
Agreeableness × Time		−0.18[b] (0.05)
Intercept (average CIRS at Wave 3)	9.72[a] (0.22)	9.73[a] (0.22)
Random effects		
Linear time variance	0.53[a] (0.07)	0.51[a] (0.07)
Quadratic time variance	0.08[a] (0.03)	0.08[a] (0.03)
Cubic time variance	0.05[a] (0.02)	0.05[a] (0.02)
Intercept variance	7.09[a] (0.49)	7.11[a] (0.49)
Residual variance	0.59[a] (0.06)	0.59[a] (0.05)
N	1,453	1,453
AIC	5,714	5,709
BIC	5,804	5,804

Notes: Entries are parameter estimates (change in CIRS scores per unit increase in predictor), beneath which standard errors are in parentheses. Personality traits scaled by interquartile range, so that 1 unit corresponds to difference between a person at 75th versus 25th percentile. [a]p ≤0.001. [b]p ≤0.01. [c]p ≤0.05. Random effect standard errors smaller than .001 are reported as zero. P-values are from z-statistics. AIC, Akaike information criteria; BIC, Bayesian information criteria.

additional year of education compared with those missing data on at least one variable.

Personality Effects Upon Illness Burden

Multivariate models are shown in Table 2. Persons higher in conscientiousness and lower in neuroticism showed lower average levels of illness burden over the course of the follow-up. Persons higher in agreeableness accumulated morbidity less rapidly over the follow-up. The interaction term indicated that a person at the 75th percentile of agreeableness would show an increase of roughly (1.28 coefficient for linear time −0.18 coefficient for interaction term =) 1.10 CIRS points per year, while at the 25th percentile of agreeableness would gain roughly 1.46 (1.28 + 0.18 =) CIRS points per year. In other words, disagreeable

persons aged medically 33% faster (1.46/1.10 = 1.163) than agreeable persons. More concretely, over the study period, a disagreeable person accumulated over 2 additional CIRS point than an agreeable one—the equivalent of moving from minor to severe burden in an organ system. This represents a within-person gauge of morbidity acceleration over time.

We also gauged the importance of personality from a between-person perspective, using model coefficients to compare two persons of differing personality, both 75 years old at baseline, in terms of their illness burden at the final wave, when both were 79. An individual at the 75th percentile of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, and 25th percentile of

Neuroticism, finished with a CIRS score of 10.5. A person average on all traits who started the study at the age of 65 years would achieve a roughly similar score 4 years later at the age of 69. By comparison, a person starting the study at the age of 75 but at the 25th percentile of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and 75th percentile of Neuroticism would have a CIRS score of 13.8 by age 79. A person average on all traits but starting the study at age 85 would achieve this state of medical deterioration by age 89. Thus, persons with beneficial personality configurations reached an end state similar to average persons 10 years younger than them, while those with maladaptive configurations reached an end state similar to those 10 years older than them.

Health Covariate Analysis

Analyses examining whether these personality effects could be accounted for by covariates are shown in Table 3. Change in estimates due to each covariate suggested that HDRS affective symptoms explained roughly 6.2% of the Neuroticism association while hypertension explained about 4.5% of the Conscientiousness association with average illness burden over follow-up. History of alcohol or substance misuse explained approximately 10% of the association of Agreeableness with the rate of morbidity accumulation. Cholesterol levels also explained 21% of the association between Neuroticism and worse illness burden over the follow-up. Entering all covariates simultaneously did not lead to appreciably larger explained variation.

FFM Subcomponent Analysis

Examination of FFM subcomponents showed that each facet of neuroticism contributed to the domain's overall effect (B (SE) each for interquartile ranges of trait anxiety and depression = 0.60 (0.16), $z = 3.89$ and $z = 3.64$, respectively; p <0.001; self-reproach = 0.43 (0.19), $z = 2.29$, p = 0.022). The conscientiousness effect was driven primarily by orderliness (B (SE) = −0.40 (0.17), $z = -2.35$, p = 0.019) and the linear combinations of orderliness and dependability (B (SE) = −0.39 (0.17), $z = -2.26$, p = 0.024) and orderliness and goal-striving (B (SE) = −0.42 (0.18), $z = -2.42$, p = 0.016). Finally, the effect of agreeableness on health decline

was attributable to nonantagonistic orientation (B (SE) = −0.21 (0.06), $z = -3.51$, p = 0.001), rather than prosocial orientation. Antagonistic older persons (25th percentile) accumulated medical burden at a 36% faster rate than their less-antagonistic (75th percentile) peers (roughly 1 additional CIRS point each year).

CONCLUSION

We hypothesized that previously observed cross-sectional associations between higher conscientiousness and lower physician-rated illness burden[13] would be replicated longitudinally in a sample of older primary care patients. Our findings extend prior cross-sectional results for the role of conscientiousness in health. Persons higher in conscientiousness entered the study in better health and maintained this advantage over the follow-up period. As in prior cross-sectional work, it was primarily the orderliness aspect of conscientiousness that proved important. However, the advantage of orderliness was potentiated when it was combined with either high levels of dependability or high levels of goal-striving. Recent meta-analytic findings also suggest an important role for this facet of conscientiousness in longevity.[35]

More conscientious older patients may enjoy better health by virtue of more cautious evaluation of health risks.[36-38] In our analysis, smoking, alcohol/substance misuse, and hypertension and hypercholesterolemia (biologic consequences of poor diet and exercise) accounted for trivial portions of the observed effect, consistent with prior findings that health behaviors account for only a modest portion of the association between conscientiousness and health outcomes.[39,40] One suggestion is that conscientiousness people may enjoy better immune functioning,[41] perhaps because their approach to life reduces stress.[42] Conscientiousness also predicts less cognitive decline in old age,[43] which may mean that this trait has an indirect effect on health through better cognitive functioning.

Second, higher neuroticism was associated with higher average illness burden over the course of the study. This is consistent with findings that higher neuroticism is a mortality risk,[44-46] although findings to the contrary also exist.[47] Roughly 6% of this risk was explained by depressive symptoms, consistent with reports that neuroticism is a risk for

TABLE 3. Effects of Covariate Adjustment on Personality Estimates

Predictor	Covariates Tested to Explain Personality Effects				
	HDRS Affective	Alcohol/ Substance	Smoking	Hyper- Tension	Fasting Cholesterol
Fixed effects					
Neuroticism	0.59[a]	0.62[a]	0.62[a]	0.61[a]	0.50[a]
	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.17)
Extraversion	−0.15	−0.17	−0.16	−0.21	−0.21
	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.17)
Openness	−0.07	−0.07	−0.06	−0.09	0.01
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)
Agreeableness	−0.23	−0.19	−0.43	−0.19	−0.31
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
Conscientiousness	−0.43[b]	−0.43[b]	−0.43[b]	−0.42[b]	−0.49[b]
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Time, years	1.28[a]	1.25[a]	1.33[a]	1.34[a]	1.35[a]
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.08)
Time, years ^{2}	−0.11[c]	−0.11[c]	−0.11[c]	−0.11[c]	−0.11[c]
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Time, years ^{3}	0.06	0.06[c]	0.06[c]	0.06[c]	0.06
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Baseline age, years	0.13[a]	0.13[a]	0.13[a]	0.12[a]	0.12[a]
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Education, years	−0.07	−0.07	−0.07	−0.05	−0.09
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Female gender	−0.49	−0.42	−0.49	−0.48	−0.47
	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Agreeableness × Time	−0.18[b]	−0.16[c]	−0.19[b]	−0.19[b]	−0.17[c]
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)
HDRS affective (Time varying)	0.09				
	(0.07)				
HDRS Affective × Time	0.03				
	(0.06)				
History of alcohol/substance abuse/dependence		0.42			
		(0.33)			
History of Alcohol/Substance Abuse/Dependence × Time		0.15			
		(0.11)			
Current smoker			−0.13		
			(0.51)		
Current Smoker × Time			−0.16		
			(0.19)		
Former smoker			−0.01		
			(0.27)		
Former Smoker × Time			−0.08		
			(0.10)		
History of hypertension				1.02[a]	
				(0.28)	
History of hypertension × Time				−0.08	
				(0.11)	
Fasting cholesterol (time varying)					−0.00
					(0.00)
Fasting Cholesterol × Time					−0.00
					(0.00)
Intercept (average CIRS at Year 3)	9.59[a]	9.59[a]	9.73[a]	9.00[a]	9.70[a]
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.28)	(0.30)	(0.23)
Random effects					
Linear time variance	0.50[a]	0.50[a]	−0.51[a]	−0.50[a]	0.50[a]
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)
Quadratic time variance	0.08[a]	0.08[a]	0.08[a]	0.08[a]	0.08[a]
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
					(Continued)

TABLE 3. (*Continued*)

	Covariates Tested to Explain Personality Effects				
Predictor	HDRS Affective	Alcohol/ Substance	Smoking	Hyper- Tension	Fasting Cholesterol
Cubic time variance	0.05[a]	−0.05[a]	0.05[a]	0.05[a]	0.05[a]
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Intercept variance	7.11[a]	7.11[a]	7.10[a]	6.89[a]	6.95[a]
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.48)
Residual variance	0.59[a]	0.59[a]	0.59[a]	0.59[a]	0.60[a]
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.49)	(0.06)	(0.06)
N	1,453	1,453	1,453	1,453	1,414
AIC	5,710	5,709	5,715	5,697	4,856
BIC	5,816	5,815	5,831	5,803	4,958

Notes: Entries are parameter estimates (change in CIRS scores per unit increase in predictor), beneath which standard errors are in parentheses. CIRS: Cumulative Illness Rating Scale; HDRS: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. Personality traits and HDRS affective scores scaled by interquartile range, so that 1 unit corresponds to difference between a person at 75th versus 25th percentile. [a] $p \leq 0.001$. [b] $p \leq 0.01$. [c] $p \leq 0.05$. P-values are from z statistics.

depression in older persons.[48,49] However, 21% of the neuroticism risk was explained by high cholesterol levels, potentially implicating poorer diet and exercise habits in those prone to emotional distress. Neuroticism may also affect illness burden through both other health behaviors not captured here and/or physiologic mechanisms related to stress sensitivity such as allostatic load.[50]

Third, we found that the rate of health decline was roughly 33% faster over the study period in those relatively low (25th percentile) compared to relatively high (75th percentile) in agreeableness. A small portion of the effect was explained by lifetime diagnosis of alcohol or substance abuse or dependence, consistent with findings that persons misusing substances, including alcohol, tend to be lower in agreeableness.[51-53] A small portion of the influence of agreeableness upon rate of health decline was due to cholesterol levels, also consistent with prior reports.[52] In particular, antagonism, or the tendency to engage in overt interpersonal conflict,[17,20] drove the overall agreeableness effect, consistent with the pathogenic effects of hostility upon elements of the cardiovascular system.[6,54] Hostile older persons probably also abdicate the health benefits of social support.[55]

The current findings have clinical, public health, and research implications. Identifying patients requiring closer long-term monitoring in clinical practice may be assisted by assessing basic dispositions. Such persons might require additional preventive precautions. In the case of hostile or disagreeable persons, lipid management and drinking patterns may be

avenues for intervention. Hostility itself can be successfully reduced in patients,[56] leading some to call for brief screening[58] of pathogenic traits in primary care settings.[57] Personality variation may also have a substantial impact at the public health level, particularly as lifespan increases in the United States. More work is needed on targeted prevention in older persons of high neuroticism, low conscientiousness, and low agreeableness, who may respond differentially to public health messages.[59] Finally, emerging findings on naturalistic personality change even in the latter years[60,61] suggest that the direct mitigation of maladaptive dispositions may deserve consideration.

Our findings must be contextualized in study strengths and limitations. While we established a robust prospective predictive role for personality with respect to medically documented illness burden, we examined only a small range of possible explanatory factors for these effects. Future work may shed additional light on this. Although prior work has documented the reliability and validity of the CIRS, only one physician made ratings in this study, precluding interrater reliability estimates. Other valid frameworks for personality measurement also exist.[62-64] We were able to establish the two components of causality possible in cohort work—association and temporal precedence of putative cause over the effect. Despite this, we urge restraint in interpretation. The potential confounding of unmeasured factors can never be fully known in any observational study. At the same time, a great benefit of our naturalistic research is

that it provides a window onto the real world. Also, though large, our sample was limited to one geographic location. Finally, we did not address the extent to which health itself influences personality change. In the end, our findings suggest that personality phenotype may capture a wide and general range of psychological and behavioral tendencies with important prognostic value over and above traditionally considered biomedical risk factors.

References

1. Chapman BP, Duberstein PR, Sörensen S, et al Personality and perceived health: the Five Factor Model in primary care. J Gerontol Psychol Sci 2006; 61B(6):P362–P365

2. Barger SD. Do psychological characteristics explain socioeconomic stratification of self-rated health? J Health Psychol 2006; 11(1):21–35

3. Roberts BW, Kuncel N, Shiner RN, et al The power of personality: a comparative analysis of the predictive validity of personality traits, SES, and IQ. Perspect Psychol Sci. 2007; 4(2): 313–346

4. Idler EL, Benyamini Y: Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. J Health Soc Behav 1997; 38(1):21–37

5. Willhelmson K, Lundin ER, Andersson C, et al: Interviews or medical records, which type of data yields the best information on elderly people's health status? Aging Clin Exper Res 2006; 18(1):25–33

6. Smith TW, Ruiz JM: Psychosocial influences on the development and course of coronary heart disease: current status and implications for research and practice. J Consult Clin Psychol 2002; 70:548–568

7. Smith TW, Spiro A: Personality, health, and aging: prolegomenon for the next generation. J Res Personal 2002; 36(4):363–394

8. Bogg T, Roberts BW: Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: a meta-analysis of the leading behavioral contributors to mortality. Psychol Bull 2004; 130(6):887–919

9. Miller GE, Cohen S, Rabin BS, et al: Personality and tonic cardiovascular, neuroendocrine, and immune parameters. Brain Behav Immun 1999; 13(2):109–123

10. Mangold DL, Wand GS: Cortisol and adrenocorticotropic hormone responses to naloxone in subjects with high and low neuroticism. Biol Psychiatry. 2006; 60(8):850–855

11. Lang FR, Staudinger UM, Carstensen LL: Perspectives on socioemotional selectivity in late life: how personality and social context do (and do not) make a difference. J Gerontol B-Psychol Sci Soc Sci 1998; 53(1):P21–P30

12. Berkman LF, Glass T: Social integration, social networks, social support, and health, in Social Epidemiology. Edited byBerkman LF, Kawachi I. New York, Oxford University Press, 2000, 137–173

13. Chapman BP, Lyness JL, Duberstein P: Personality and medical illness burden among older adults in primary care. Psychosom Med 2007; 69:277–282

14. Goldberg LR. The structure of phenotypic personality traits. Am Psychol 1993; 48(1):26,34

15. McCrae RR, Costa PT, Jr: Personality trait structure as a human universal. Am Psychol 1997; 52:509–516

16. Lahey BB: Public health significance of neuroticism. Am Psychol 2009; 64(4):241–256

17. Chapman BP: Optimizing bandwidth and fidelity on the NEO-FFI: replicability and reliability of Saucier's (1998) item cluster subcomponents. J Pers Assess 2007; 88(2):220–234

18. Costa PT, McCrae RR: Domains and facets: hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. J Pers Assess 1995; 64(1):21–50

19. Costa PT, McCrae RR: Revised NEO Personality Inventory and NEO Five Factor Inventory: Professional Manual. Odessa, FL, Psychological Assessment, 1992

20. Saucier G: Replicable item–cluster subcomponents in the NEO Five-Factor Inventory. J Pers Assess 1998; 70(2):263–276

21. Chapman BP, Duberstein PD, Sörensen S, et al: Gender differences in Five Factor Model personality traits in an elderly cohort. Pers Ind Dif. 2007; 43(6):1594–1603

22. Harrell FE: Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis. New York, Springer, 2001

23. Linn BS, Linn MW, Gurel L: Cumulative Illness Rating Scale. J Am Geriatr Soc 1968; 16:622–626

24. Hudon C, Fortin V, Vanasse A: Cumulative Illness Rating Scale was a reliable and valid index in a family practice context. J Clin Epi 2005; 58(6):603–608

25. Conwell Y, Forbes NT, Cox C, et al: Validation of a measure of physical illness burden at autopsy: the Cumulative Illness Rating Scale. J Am Geriatr Soc 1993:38–41

26. Fortin M, Dubois MF, Hudon C, et al: Multimorbidity and quality of life: a closer look. Health Qual Life Out 2007; 5(1):52

27. Rochon PA, Katz JN, Morrow LA, et al: Chronic illness is associated with survival and length of hospital stay in patients with chronic disability—a prospective comparison of three comorbidity indices. Med Care 1996; 34(11):1093–1101

28. Bo M, Cacello E, Ghihhia F, et al: Predictive factors of clinical outcomes in older surgical patients. Arch Ger Geri 2007; 44(3):215–224

29. Waldman EPJ: A prospective evaluation of the cumulative illness rating-scale. Aging-Clin Exp Res 1992; 4(2):171–178.

30. Williams JBW: A structured interview guide for the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1988; 45:742–747.

31. Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JBW. Structured Clinical Interview for Axis I DSM-IV Disorders. New York, Biometrics Research Department, New York State Psychiatric Institute, 1994

32. Blackwell E, de Leon CFM, Miller GE: Applying mixed regression models of the analysis of repeated measures data in psychosomatic medicine. Psychosom Med 2006; 68:870–878

33. Enders C: A primer on the use of modern missing-data methods in psychosomatic medicine research. Psycosom Med 2006; 68(3):427–436

34. Mickey R, Greenland S: The impact of confounder selection criteria on effect estimation. Am J Epidemiol 1989; 129:125–137

35. Kern ML, Friedman HS: Do conscientious individuals live longer? A quantitative review. Health Psychol 2008; 27(5):505–512

36. Hampson SE, Andrews JA, Barckley M, et al: Personality traits, perceived risk, and risk-reduction behaviors: a further study of smoking and radon. Health Psychol 2006; 25(4):530–536

37. Soane E, Chmiel N: Are risk preferences consistent? The influence of decision domain and personality. Pers Ind Dif. 2005; 38(8):1781–1791

38. Hampson SE, Andrews JA, Barckley M, et al: Conscientiousness, perceived risk, and risk-reduction behaviors: a preliminary study. Health Psychol 2000; 19(5):496–500

39. Lodi-Smith JL, Jackson JJ, Bogg T, et al: Mechanisms of health: education and health-related behaviors partially mediate the relationship between conscientiousness and self-reported physical health. Psychol Health 2010; 25(4):305–319

40. Martin LR, Friedman HS, Schwartz JE: Personality and mortality risk across the life span: the importance of conscientiousness as a biopsychosocial attribute. Health Psychol 2007; 26(4):428–436

41. Segerstrom SC, Castaneda JO, Spencer TE: Optimism effects on cellular immunity: testing the affective and persistence models. Pers Ind Dif 2003; 35:1615–1624

42. Penley JA, Tomaka J: Associations among the Big Five, emotional responses, and coping with acute stress. Pers Ind Dif. 2002; 32(7):1215–1228

43. Wilson RS, Schneider JA, Arnold SE, et al: Conscientiousness and the incidence of Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment. Arch Gen Psych 2007; 64(10):1204–1212

44. Wilson RS, Krueger KR, Gu LP, et al: Neuroticism, extraversion, and mortality in a defined population of older persons. Psychosom Med 2005; 67(6):841–845

45. Mroczek DK, Spiro A: Personality change influences mortality in older men. Psychol Sci 2007; 18(5):371–376

46. Shipley BA, Weiss A, Der G, et al: Neuroticism, extraversion, and mortality in the UK Health and Lifestyle Survey: a 21-year prospective cohort study. Psychosom Med 2007; 69(9):923–931

47. Weiss A, Costa PT: Domain and facet personality predictors of all-cause mortality among Medicare patients aged 65 to 100. Psychosom Med 2005; 67(5):724–733

48. Lyness JM, Duberstein PR, King DA, et al: Medical illness burden, trait neuroticism, and depression in older primary care patients. Am J Psychiatry 1998; 155(7):969–971

49. Duberstein PR, Pálsson SP, Waern M, et al: Personality and risk for depression in a birth cohort of 70-year-olds followed for 15 years. Psychol Med 2008; 38(5):663-671

50. Korte SM, Koolhaas JM, Wingfield JC, et al: The Darwinian concept of stress: benefits of allostasis and costs of allostatic load and the trade-offs in health and disease. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2005; 29(1):3-38

51. Malouff JM, Thorsteinsson EB, Rooke SE, et al: Alcohol involvement and the Five-Factor Model of Personality: a meta-analysis. J Drug Ed 2007; 37(3):277–294

52. Wilson D, Davidson KW, Barksdale C, et al: U-curved relation between total fasting serum cholesterol and hostility: a population-based study. Int J Behav Med 2001; 8(4):282–292

53. Chassin L, Flora DB, King KM: Trajectories of alcohol and drug use and dependence from adolescence to adulthood: the effects of familial alcoholism and personality. J Abnorm Psychol 2004; 113(4):483–498

54. Smith TW, Glazer K, Ruiz JM, et al: Hostility, anger, aggressiveness, and coronary heart disease: an interpersonal perspective on personality, emotion, and health. J Pers 2004; 72(6):1217–1270

55. Selfhout MHW, Burk WJ, Denissen JJA, et al: Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and big five personality traits. J Pers 2010; 78(2):509–538

56. Gidron Y, Davidson K, Bata I: The short-term effects of a hostility-reduction intervention on male coronary heart disease patients. Health Psychol 1999;18(4):416-420

57. Kubzansky LD, Kawachi I, Sparrow D: Socioeconomic status, hostility, and risk factor clustering in the normative aging study: any help from the concept of allostatic load? Ann Behav Med 1999; 21(4):330–338

58. De Raad B, Perugini M, ed. Big Five Assessment. Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, 2002

59. Noar SM, Benac CN, Harris MS: Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of tailored print health behavior change interventions. Psychol Bull 2007; 133(4):673–693

60. Roberts BW, DelVecchio WF: The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: a quantitative review of longitudinal studies. Psychol Bull 2000; 126(1):3–25

61. Roberts BW, Walton KE, Viechtbauer W. Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: a meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. Psychol Bull 2006; 132(1):1–25

62. Mischel W, Shoda Y: Integrating dispositions and processing dynamics within a unified theory of personality: the cognitive–affective personality system, in Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research. Edited by Pervin LA, John OP, 2nd ed. New York, Guilford Press, 1999, pp 197–218

63. Hooker K, McAdams DP: Personality reconsidered: a new agenda for aging research. J Gerontol B-Psychol Sci Soc Sci 2003; 58(6):P296–P304

64. Smith TW: Personality as risk and resilience in physical health. Curr Dir Psychol Sci 2006; 15(5):227–231