



Croatian Adaptation and Validation of the B5T® Big Five Personality Test

Evidence from an Organizational Assessment Sample

Iva Sofija Miloš, mag. psych. • Fanika Ivaković, mag. psych. • Slobodan Jović, dipl. psih., prof.

Selekcija d.o.o. | Split, Croatia

[Selekcija.hr](https://selekcija.hr) | [Recruiter.hr](https://recruiter.hr)

Croatian B5T validation report

Abstract

The B5T® is a 72-item personality questionnaire assessing the Big Five dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness, and Agreeableness, together with three basic motives - Need for Achievement, Need for Power, and Need for Security - and a response-honesty scale. The instrument was translated and adapted for Croatian use in 2023 and implemented on the Selekcija.hr online assessment platform. This report presents evidence from the Croatian validation program. The cumulative dataset comprised 1,622 respondents; age information was available for 1,543 participants ($M = 36.37$, $SD = 9.20$, range = 19-69). Internal consistency was adequate to high across the eight substantive scales (Cronbach's $\alpha = .73-.87$). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses broadly reproduced the intended five-factor personality and three-factor motive structure. Sociodemographic analyses identified selected effects relevant to Croatian norm development. Convergent-divergent validity was further supported by theoretically coherent correlations with work-style measures, work motives and values, HEXACO-PI-R 100, and the Big Five Aspect Scales. Taken together, the findings provide converging support for the reliability and construct validity of the Croatian B5T in the organizational assessment population in which it has been used.

Keywords: B5T, Big Five, personality assessment, motives, Croatian adaptation, validation, organizational psychology

1. Introduction

The B5T® Big Five Personality Test was developed by Lars Satow to assess the five broad personality dimensions of the Big Five model: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness, and Agreeableness. In addition to these personality dimensions, the B5T assesses three basic motives: Need for Achievement, Need for Power, and Need for Security. The motive scales were included to complement the description of basic personality structure with information about a person's motivational potential and possible direction of development.

The current version contains 72 statements: 50 personality items (10 per Big Five dimension), 18 motive items (six per motive), and four items assessing honesty in responding. Items are answered using a four-point response format. The B5T also includes a plausibility check designed to identify unusual or implausible response patterns. A particular consideration in its development was suitability for occupational settings: items were formulated so that they would not be experienced as overly private, inappropriate, or uncomfortable in professional assessment.

The B5T was designed from the outset with professional applications in mind, including career counselling, personnel selection, personnel development, and coaching. Its combination of the five broad personality dimensions with the three basic motives provides a concise assessment of both personality structure and motivational orientation.

A Croatian version of the B5T was developed in 2023 in response to the need for a brief, digitally applicable personality and motive questionnaire for organizational assessment. The purpose of the present report is to describe the Croatian adaptation procedure and to present the accumulated Croatian evidence concerning internal consistency, factor structure, sociodemographic effects relevant to norming, and convergent-divergent construct validity.

2. Method

2.1 Croatian translation and adaptation

The adaptation followed a multi-step translation procedure. Two independent Croatian translations were first prepared and then reviewed by experts. Areas of agreement and discrepancy were examined, and a single provisional Croatian version was produced collaboratively. A back-translation into the source language was subsequently carried out. Remaining discrepancies were reviewed by the expert team; where necessary, other available language versions of the B5T were consulted. The final wording of every item was agreed by consensus.

2.2 Instrument and administration

The Croatian B5T was implemented in digital form on the Selekcija.hr assessment platform. Respondents receive a standardized instruction emphasizing that there are no correct or incorrect answers and that they should respond openly and honestly. The 72 items are presented sequentially, with four response options ranging from "does not apply to me at

all" to "applies to me completely". Respondents can review and change earlier responses before completing the questionnaire. Scoring is automated according to the test key.

2.3 Participants and validation data

Data for the Croatian validation were collected through the Selekcija.hr online assessment platform in an organizational assessment context. Data collection began in August 2023, and the available dataset grew cumulatively as the Croatian version continued to be administered on the platform.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Croatian validation sample

Sex	Education	N	Age missing	M age	SD age	Age range
Men	Lower/secondary	174	66	35.0	9.9	19-60
Men	Higher/university	441	8	37.4	9.0	22-69
Women	Lower/secondary	233	1	35.8	9.7	21-58
Women	Higher/university	688	4	36.9	8.9	23-63
Other	Higher/university	1	0	29		
Sex unavailable	Lower/secondary	4	0	34.0	16.0	26-41
Sex unavailable	Higher/university	2	0	33.5	10.6	
Total age-available sample		1543	79	36.37	9.20	19-69

2.4 Analytical strategy

Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. To examine latent structure while reducing the risk of capitalizing on the same observations in exploratory and confirmatory analyses, the cumulative dataset was randomly divided into two independent subsamples. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted in random_1 using maximum likelihood extraction with oblimin rotation, allowing the factors to correlate. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then conducted in random_2 using diagonally weighted least squares (DWLS), appropriate for the four-category ordinal response format. The CFA models were additionally replicated in the full sample.

Sociodemographic effects were examined using a three-way analysis of variance with sex, age group, and education as factors in a randomly selected, approximately balanced subsample (N = 334). Age was grouped into 21-35, 36-50, and 51+ years, while education was grouped as lower/secondary versus higher/university education. These analyses were also used to inform the Croatian norming approach. Construct validity was examined through correlations with external work-style, motive, value, and personality measures administered to overlapping subsamples.

3. Results

3.1 Internal consistency

Table 2. Internal consistency of B5T scales in the Croatian validation sample (N = 1,622)

Scale	Cronbach's α
Neuroticism	.87
Extraversion	.83
Conscientiousness	.73
Openness	.75
Agreeableness	.74
Need for Achievement (nA)	.74

Scale	Cronbach's α
Need for Power (nP)	.73
Need for Security (nS)	.85

Internal consistency was adequate across all substantive scales. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .73 to .87. Neuroticism (.87) and Need for Security (.85) showed the highest coefficients, while the remaining personality and motive scales ranged from .73 to .83. Overall, these coefficients support the reliability of the Croatian B5T scale scores in the validation sample.

3.2 Factor structure

In the EFA subsample, a five-factor solution was extracted for the Big Five items and a three-factor solution for the motive items. The Big Five solution explained approximately 33% of the variance and broadly reproduced the intended structure. Neuroticism showed high and consistent loadings, while Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness formed interpretable dimensions. Agreeableness was less clearly defined, with fewer items reaching strong loadings. The motive solution explained approximately 43% of the variance. Need for Security showed particularly clear loadings, while Need for Achievement and Need for Power displayed the theoretically expected conceptual proximity.

Table 3. Characteristics of the EFA subsample (random_1)

Sex	Education	N	Age missing	M age	SD age	Age range
Men	Lower/secondary	101	37	35.4	10.4	19-60
Men	Higher/university	212	6	37.1	8.7	22-61
Women	Lower/secondary	128	1	36.2	10.1	21-58
Women	Higher/university	319	3	36.7	8.7	23-60
Other	Higher/university	1	0	29		29
Sex unavailable	Lower/secondary	2	0	42	22.6	26-58
Sex unavailable	Higher/university	1	0	41		41
Total		764	47	36.5	9.2	19-61

Table 4. Characteristics of the CFA subsample (random_2)

Sex	Education	N	Age missing	M age	SD age	Age range
Men	Lower/secondary	73	29	34.3	9.2	21-60
Men	Higher/university	229	2	37.8	9.3	23-69
Women	Lower/secondary	105	0	35.3	9.1	21-57
Women	Higher/university	369	1	37.2	9.1	23-63
Sex unavailable	Lower/secondary	2	0	26	0	26-26
Sex unavailable	Higher/university	1	0	26		26
Total		779	32	36.8	9.2	21-69

Table 5. CFA model-fit indices

Analysis	Model	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Independent CFA subsample	Big Five (5 factors)	.936	.932	.074	.083

Analysis	Model	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Independent CFA subsample	Needs (3 factors)	.957	.950	.097	.084
Full sample replication	Big Five (5 factors)	.928	.924	.078	.082
Full sample replication	Needs (3 factors)	.956	.952	.097	.078

Note. CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

The independent CFA supported the intended structure overall. For the five-factor Big Five model, CFI = .936 and TLI = .932, with RMSEA = .074 and SRMR = .083. For the three-factor motives model, CFI = .957 and TLI = .950, while RMSEA = .097 and SRMR = .084. The full-sample replications produced a very similar pattern. Thus, the Big Five model showed acceptable-to-good fit across indices. The motives model showed strong CFI/TLI values, whereas RMSEA was elevated; this mixed pattern should be considered when interpreting the model rather than relying on a single fit index. Overall, the similarity of findings across the independent CFA subsample and the full sample supports the stability of the intended factor structure.

3.3 Sociodemographic effects and Croatian norming

A three-way ANOVA examined whether B5T scale scores differed as a function of sex, age group, and education. The balanced subsample used for these analyses comprised 334 respondents. Descriptive statistics for the defined subgroups are presented in Table 6, and the omnibus effects are shown in Table 7.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics by sex, age, and education (M [SD])

Sex	Education	Age (N)	N	E	C	O	A	nA	nP	nS	Honesty
Women	Lower/sec.	21-35 (30)	20.83 (4.14)	32.13 (4.00)	32.27 (3.25)	31.40 (3.64)	34.17 (3.26)	14.97 (3.06)	14.03 (3.32)	19.00 (2.52)	8.57 (1.68)
Women	Lower/sec.	36-50 (30)	20.53 (4.13)	31.23 (3.26)	30.40 (3.20)	29.30 (3.39)	33.50 (2.93)	12.83 (2.87)	11.93 (2.42)	17.10 (3.39)	8.67 (2.20)
Women	Lower/sec.	51+ (19)	20.95 (3.22)	32.05 (3.69)	30.00 (3.06)	28.42 (3.69)	33.32 (3.13)	13.16 (2.81)	11.21 (1.78)	18.05 (3.36)	8.95 (1.58)
Men	Lower/sec.	21-35 (30)	19.27 (3.89)	31.10 (2.98)	29.43 (2.46)	29.50 (3.67)	33.63 (2.92)	12.77 (2.62)	12.00 (2.45)	16.87 (2.87)	8.33 (2.20)
Men	Lower/sec.	36-50 (30)	18.97 (3.65)	30.27 (3.89)	29.67 (2.73)	29.23 (3.58)	32.77 (2.86)	13.33 (2.09)	12.37 (5.65)	16.13 (2.58)	8.93 (2.16)
Men	Lower/sec.	51+ (15)	19.40 (3.27)	30.80 (3.30)	31.13 (3.42)	29.93 (3.90)	32.73 (2.94)	13.07 (1.94)	12.80 (2.21)	17.93 (3.03)	8.20 (2.01)
Women	Higher/univ.	21-35 (30)	20.07 (4.51)	31.23 (3.63)	31.13 (3.44)	30.43 (4.12)	34.47 (3.31)	13.47 (2.97)	12.43 (2.42)	17.10 (2.78)	7.33 (2.48)
Women	Higher/univ.	36-50 (30)	20.70 (3.70)	28.90 (3.46)	29.53 (2.54)	28.63 (4.11)	31.87 (2.69)	13.23 (2.53)	12.83 (2.69)	16.70 (3.13)	8.70 (1.80)
Women	Higher/univ.	51+ (30)	20.63 (3.46)	30.40 (3.69)	30.30 (2.90)	30.33 (2.48)	32.43 (3.02)	13.50 (2.49)	12.33 (2.37)	16.90 (2.37)	8.03 (1.71)
Men	Higher/univ.	21-35 (30)	19.37 (5.70)	28.50 (4.32)	30.87 (3.05)	31.20 (4.22)	32.97 (2.54)	13.80 (2.91)	13.20 (2.92)	16.87 (2.46)	8.37 (2.37)
Men	Higher/univ.	36-50 (30)	18.47 (3.41)	29.57 (3.17)	30.40 (4.03)	30.50 (3.51)	32.17 (3.15)	13.77 (2.13)	13.17 (1.88)	15.80 (2.23)	8.50 (2.03)
Men	Higher/univ.	51+ (30)	19.27 (3.20)	29.00 (4.61)	29.37 (3.81)	30.20 (3.80)	32.33 (2.54)	13.53 (2.83)	12.33 (2.84)	15.40 (2.85)	8.60 (2.16)

Table 7. Three-way ANOVA: effects of sex, age, and education on B5T scale scores (N = 334)

Dependent variable	Effect	SS	df	F	p
Neuroticism	Sex	188.01	1	11.96	< .01
Neuroticism	Education	3.70	1	0.24	.63
Neuroticism	Age	8.44	2	0.27	.76
Neuroticism	Sex × Education	0.34	1	0.02	.88
Neuroticism	Sex × Age	8.90	2	0.28	.75
Neuroticism	Education × Age	0.43	2	0.01	.99
Neuroticism	Sex × Education × Age	8.84	2	0.28	.76
Extraversion	Sex	107.59	1	7.81	.01
Extraversion	Education	222.85	1	16.17	< .01
Extraversion	Age	36.16	2	1.31	.27
Extraversion	Sex × Education	0.20	1	0.01	.90
Extraversion	Sex × Age	46.82	2	1.70	.18
Extraversion	Education × Age	0.94	2	0.03	.97
Extraversion	Sex × Education × Age	41.72	2	1.51	.22
Conscientiousness	Sex	29.10	1	2.87	.09
Conscientiousness	Education	2.70	1	0.27	.61
Conscientiousness	Age	61.02	2	3.01	.05
Conscientiousness	Sex × Education	22.89	1	2.26	.13
Conscientiousness	Sex × Age	41.60	2	2.05	.13
Conscientiousness	Education × Age	7.62	2	0.38	.69
Conscientiousness	Sex × Education × Age	71.68	2	3.54	.03
Openness	Sex	6.03	1	0.44	.51
Openness	Education	22.87	1	1.68	.20
Openness	Age	93.16	2	3.42	.03
Openness	Sex × Education	32.41	1	2.38	.12
Openness	Sex × Age	32.64	2	1.20	.30
Openness	Education × Age	11.97	2	0.44	.65
Openness	Sex × Education × Age	63.64	2	2.33	.10
Agreeableness	Sex	22.60	1	2.60	.11
Agreeableness	Education	41.06	1	4.73	.03
Agreeableness	Age	106.92	2	6.16	< .01
Agreeableness	Sex × Education	0.74	1	0.09	.77
Agreeableness	Sex × Age	11.32	2	0.65	.52
Agreeableness	Education × Age	13.07	2	0.75	.47
Agreeableness	Sex × Education × Age	15.80	2	0.91	.40
Need for Achievement	Sex	1.74	1	0.25	.62

Dependent variable	Effect	SS	df	F	p
Need for Achievement	Education	2.01	1	0.29	.59
Need for Achievement	Age	14.66	2	1.05	.35
Need for Achievement	Sex × Education	19.74	1	2.81	.09
Need for Achievement	Sex × Age	31.63	2	2.25	.11
Need for Achievement	Education × Age	8.23	2	0.59	.56
Need for Achievement	Sex × Education × Age	28.75	2	2.05	.13
Need for Power	Sex	0.62	1	0.09	.76
Need for Power	Education	6.53	1	0.99	.32
Need for Power	Age	31.88	2	2.42	.09
Need for Power	Sex × Education	8.55	1	1.30	.26
Need for Power	Sex × Age	21.82	2	1.66	.19
Need for Power	Education × Age	16.65	2	1.27	.28
Need for Power	Sex × Education × Age	65.74	2	5.00	.01
Need for Security	Sex	95.26	1	12.23	< .01
Need for Security	Education	76.51	1	9.82	< .01
Need for Security	Age	63.06	2	4.05	.02
Need for Security	Sex × Education	3.11	1	0.40	.53
Need for Security	Sex × Age	0.97	2	0.06	.94
Need for Security	Education × Age	24.99	2	1.60	.20
Need for Security	Sex × Education × Age	34.73	2	2.23	.11
Honesty	Sex	2.64	1	0.62	.43
Honesty	Age	11.37	1	2.66	.10
Honesty	Education	18.36	2	2.15	.12
Honesty	Sex × Age	7.82	1	1.83	.18
Honesty	Sex × Education	2.72	2	0.32	.73
Honesty	Age × Education	2.62	2	0.31	.74
Honesty	Sex × Age × Education	14.57	2	1.71	.18

Significant effects were observed for selected scales rather than uniformly across the questionnaire. Sex effects were identified for Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Need for Security; age effects were observed for Openness, Agreeableness, and Need for Security; and education was associated with Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Need for Security. Several interaction effects were also present. These results were considered when updating the Croatian norms.

Croatian results are reported in the Selekcija.hr system as T-scores. The reference metric has a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10; scores from 40 to 60 T are interpreted as broadly average, while lower and higher values indicate progressively less or more pronounced expression of the measured characteristic. Where sociodemographic effects were relevant, the norming procedure uses the corresponding reference-group descriptive parameters. Because the validation dataset was collected in an organizational assessment context rather than through probability sampling of the Croatian population, these values are most appropriately interpreted as reference norms for the population represented in the Croatian assessment data.

3.4 Construct validity

Convergent-divergent validity was examined using several external instruments. Across analyses, conceptually similar constructs generally showed stronger correlations, whereas theoretically more distinct constructs tended to show weaker associations. The external comparisons were based on different overlapping subsamples, as described below.

3.4.1 Work conscientiousness and stability

In a sample of 246 respondents, B5T scores were correlated with scales from the Work Conscientiousness and Stability Questionnaire. The pattern was theoretically coherent: Neuroticism was negatively related to resilience/emotion control ($r = -.56$), emotional adjustment ($r = -.53$), and stress control ($r = -.46$), while Conscientiousness correlated positively with Perfectionism ($r = .43$) and negatively with Tolerance for untidiness ($r = -.44$).

Table 8. Correlations between B5T scales and the Work Conscientiousness and Stability Questionnaire ($n = 246$)

Scale	Resilience & emotion control	Emotional adjustment	Stress control	Perfectionism	Tolerance for untidiness	Leadership	Control of others
Neuroticism	-.56	-.53	-.46	.06	-.04	-.24	.06
Extraversion	.24	.21	.21	.23	-.10	.35	.14
Conscientiousness	.04	.07	-.01	.43	-.44	.05	.10
Openness	.14	.15	.09	.09	-.02	.22	-.11
Agreeableness	.27	.31	.15	.20	-.20	-.07	-.13
Need for Achievement (nA)	-.14	-.10	-.16	.30	-.11	.19	.27
Need for Power (nP)	.02	-.01	.06	.29	-.12	.36	.36
Need for Security (nS)	-.22	-.21	-.17	.20	-.24	-.19	.12
Honesty / response honesty	-.29	-.30	-.20	-.23	.19	-.03	.10

3.4.2 Work motives and values

A smaller subsample ($n = 76$) completed both the B5T and a questionnaire assessing work motives and values. The clearest relations were observed for Need for Power with power/status ($r = .70$) and power/management ($r = .61$), and for Need for Security with the Security motive ($r = .49$). Need for Achievement was also strongly related to power/status ($r = .62$).

Table 9. Correlations between B5T scales and work motives and values ($n = 76$)

Scale	Earnings	Power-status	Power-management	Self-direction	Recognition	Connections	Altruism	Aesthetics	Stimulation	Hedonism	Security	Conformity-rules
Neuroticism	.20	-.09	-.02	-.03	-.08	-.08	-.11	-.27	-.23	.09	-.06	-.18
Extraversion	.04	.15	.08	.12	.19	.23	.20	.29	.17	.34	.25	.10
Conscientiousness	-.03	.19	.09	-.12	.27	.27	.21	.09	.24	-.06	.31	.31
Openness	-.02	.16	.21	.31	.02	.15	.30	.45	.36	.33	-.11	.04
Agreeableness	-.18	-.03	-.08	.08	.06	.17	.31	.28	.28	.20	.11	.20
Need for Achievement (nA)	.38	.62	.47	.31	.43	.46	.17	.18	.14	.16	.16	.21

Scale	Earn gs	Powe r- statu s	Power- managem ent	Self- directi on	Recogniti on	Connectio ns	Altruism	Aestheti cs	Stimulati on	Hedonis m	Securi ty	Conformit y-rules
Need for Power (nP)	.52	.70	.61	.29	.41	.51	.12	.05	.22	.12	.04	.11
Need for Security (nS)	.21	.20	.01	.04	.21	.18	.00	-.18	-.23	-.06	.49	.15
Honesty / response honesty	.10	-.19	.00	.17	-.18	-.10	-.20	-.24	-.26	.03	-.02	-.10

3.4.3 HEXACO-PI-R 100

The B5T was administered together with the HEXACO-PI-R 100 in a sample of 299 respondents. The strongest same-domain association was between the two Extraversion measures ($r = .66$). B5T Openness correlated .58 with HEXACO Openness to Experience, B5T Conscientiousness correlated .51 with HEXACO Conscientiousness, and B5T Neuroticism correlated .50 with HEXACO Emotionality. This pattern supports convergence while also showing that the instruments are not redundant.

Table 10. Correlations between B5T and HEXACO-PI-R 100 scales (N = 299)

HEXACO-PI-R 100 scale	N	E	C	O	A	nA	nP	nS	Honesty
Honesty-Humility	-.15	-.01	.11	-.02	.26	-.52	-.49	.05	-.42
Sincerity	-.13	.01	.07	-.05	.14	-.35	-.32	-.01	-.27
Fairness	-.21	.17	.26	.06	.35	-.20	-.15	.09	-.46
Greed Avoidance	-.04	-.16	.00	-.07	.11	-.50	-.48	.01	-.26
Modesty	-.08	-.03	.00	.00	.18	-.48	-.49	.05	-.26
Emotionality	.50	-.06	.01	-.09	.02	.02	-.20	.29	.09
Fearfulness	.40	-.13	.05	-.16	.00	.03	-.17	.30	.07
Anxiety	.58	-.18	-.01	-.02	-.07	.12	-.04	.26	.23
Dependence	.19	.07	-.09	-.05	-.03	.05	-.09	.10	.07
Sentimentality	.19	.08	.09	-.02	.17	-.14	-.24	.13	-.13
Extraversion	-.51	.66	.24	.27	.43	-.11	.10	-.14	-.30
Social Self-Esteem	-.54	.38	.24	.15	.34	-.13	.02	-.10	-.32
Social Boldness	-.34	.57	.19	.31	.27	.02	.27	-.15	-.10
Sociability	-.25	.57	.19	.24	.44	-.12	-.02	-.02	-.21
Liveliness	-.50	.53	.15	.12	.33	-.13	.00	-.16	-.34
Agreeableness	-.34	.21	.06	.08	.38	-.28	-.15	-.06	-.32
Forgiveness	-.18	.07	-.03	-.02	.16	-.19	-.11	-.07	-.21
Gentleness	-.19	.23	.10	.02	.39	-.23	-.22	.05	-.28
Flexibility	-.24	.18	.04	.04	.33	-.26	-.15	-.03	-.26
Patience	-.40	.17	.07	.21	.29	-.17	.02	-.12	-.22
Conscientiousness	-.43	.38	.51	.23	.34	-.09	.06	.06	-.40
Organization	-.37	.35	.42	.13	.27	-.16	.00	.08	-.42

HEXACO-PI-R 100 scale	N	E	C	O	A	nA	nP	nS	Honesty
Diligence	-.44	.36	.39	.22	.33	-.08	.11	-.03	-.32
Perfectionism	-.08	.23	.50	.26	.25	.13	.12	.22	-.18
Prudence	-.47	.23	.27	.10	.20	-.18	-.03	-.08	-.32
Openness to Experience	-.18	.12	.09	.58	.18	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.15
Aesthetic Appreciation	-.10	.06	.12	.37	.19	-.11	-.12	.10	-.12
Inquisitiveness	-.27	.13	.13	.47	.14	-.02	.08	-.03	-.20
Creativity	-.06	.21	.06	.49	.18	.06	.00	-.04	-.12
Unconventionality	-.12	-.07	-.05	.50	.06	.05	.03	-.07	-.01
Altruism	-.14	.26	.16	.15	.46	-.19	-.17	.04	-.30

3.4.4 Big Five Aspect Scales (BFAS)

The strongest convergent evidence was obtained in the BFAS comparison ($N = 411$). B5T Neuroticism correlated .74 with BFAS Neuroticism and .77 with Withdrawal; B5T Extraversion correlated .67 with BFAS Extraversion; B5T Conscientiousness correlated .63 with BFAS Conscientiousness; and B5T Openness correlated .66 with BFAS Openness/Intellect. Agreeableness showed a more moderate same-domain correlation ($r = .46$), consistent with somewhat different construct coverage across the two questionnaires.

Table 11. Correlations between B5T and Big Five Aspect Scales (BFAS; $N = 411$)

BFAS scale	N	E	C	O	A	nA	nP	nS	Honesty
Neuroticism	.74	-.34	-.25	-.11	-.35	.23	-.01	.23	.39
Withdrawal	.77	-.37	-.18	-.13	-.25	.21	-.04	.30	.36
Volatility	.59	-.26	-.28	-.08	-.39	.21	.03	.12	.36
Agreeableness	-.07	.18	.16	.17	.46	-.25	-.26	.07	-.26
Compassion	-.01	.27	.08	.27	.36	-.06	-.11	.04	-.08
Politeness	-.11	.03	.19	.01	.41	-.36	-.32	.08	-.35
Extraversion	-.35	.67	.23	.34	.44	.02	.13	-.09	-.22
Enthusiasm	-.30	.68	.15	.25	.46	-.06	.00	-.07	-.26
Assertiveness	-.32	.47	.26	.35	.31	.12	.25	-.10	-.11
Conscientiousness	-.39	.32	.63	.15	.47	-.09	.07	.10	-.46
Industriousness	-.56	.37	.48	.19	.45	-.14	.07	-.08	-.49
Orderliness	-.14	.19	.63	.07	.38	-.02	.05	.25	-.33
Openness/Intellect	-.08	.22	.23	.66	.33	.11	.09	.03	-.04
Openness	.15	.09	.11	.55	.22	.10	.01	.15	.05
Intellect	-.29	.28	.28	.58	.35	.08	.14	-.11	-.13

Note. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; nA = Need for Achievement; nP = Need for Power; nS = Need for Security.

4. Discussion

The Croatian adaptation of the B5T was developed to make a brief, professionally oriented measure of broad personality traits and basic motives available for Croatian organizational assessment. The present findings provide several complementary forms of psychometric evidence. First, all eight substantive scales showed satisfactory internal consistency in the cumulative sample, with coefficients ranging from .73 to .87. Second, the expected five-factor personality and three-factor motive structures were broadly reproduced in exploratory analyses and supported in independent confirmatory analyses. Third, correlations with external measures followed theoretically meaningful convergent-divergent patterns.

The structural findings are strongest when considered as a pattern rather than through any single index. The Big Five CFA showed acceptable-to-good fit and was stable across the independent CFA subsample and full-sample replication. For the motives model, CFI and TLI were strong, whereas RMSEA was higher. The exploratory analyses also showed that Agreeableness was somewhat less sharply defined than the other Big Five dimensions. These observations identify specific features that warrant continued monitoring, but they do not alter the broader consistency between the theoretical model, the exploratory results, and the confirmatory results.

The external correlations add important evidence beyond internal structure. B5T Neuroticism showed the expected negative associations with work-related emotional stability indicators and strong convergence with BFAS Neuroticism. Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness also showed their strongest or among their strongest associations with corresponding domains in other personality models. The motive scales behaved in theoretically interpretable ways, particularly in relation to power/status, management, and security motives. Together, these results support the interpretation of B5T scores as indicators of the intended personality and motivational constructs.

The sociodemographic analyses also have practical implications. Selected scale scores varied by sex, age, and education, which was taken into account in the Croatian norming procedure. At the same time, these effects were not uniform across all scales. The norms therefore reflect empirical patterns observed in the Croatian assessment data rather than assuming that a single demographic adjustment is necessary for every dimension.

4.1 Limitations and directions for further validation

The findings should be interpreted in light of the sampling context. The Croatian data were accumulated primarily among individuals using an online organizational assessment platform, the sample contained more women than men, and higher education was overrepresented. The sample is therefore not a probability sample of the Croatian adult population. Accordingly, the normative data are best understood as reference values for the relevant Croatian organizational assessment population. In addition, the construct-validity analyses relied on different overlapping subsamples and are correlational. Future work can extend the evidence base by examining predictive and criterion-related validity, further replication across occupational groups, and the stability of subgroup differences as additional Croatian data accumulate.

5. Conclusion

The Croatian B5T shows adequate to high internal consistency, broadly replicates the intended five-factor personality and three-factor motive structure, and demonstrates theoretically coherent relations with external personality, work-style, motive, and value measures. The adaptation procedure combined independent translation, expert review, back-translation, and consensus, followed by empirical evaluation in a Croatian organizational assessment context. Taken together, the available findings provide converging support for the reliability and construct validity of the Croatian version and support its continued use as one source of information in professionally conducted organizational assessment.

References

Satow, L. (2020a). B5T® Big-Five-Persönlichkeitstest: Test- und Skalendokumentation.

Satow, L. (2020b). B5T® Big-Five-Persönlichkeitstest: Testmanual und Normen.

Satow, L. (2021). Reliability and Validity of the Enhanced Big Five Personality Test (B5T).

Source note. The Croatian adaptation procedure, analyses, and numerical results reported in this paper are based on the Croatian B5T validation documentation prepared by Selekcija.hr. General information about the B5T, its development,

structure, motives, response-quality procedures, and intended professional applications follows the original B5T documentation (Satow, 2020a, 2020b, 2021).

B5T® is a registered trademark of Dr. Lars Satow. Copyright in the original B5T test materials and documentation belongs to Dr. Lars Satow. This publication reports the Croatian adaptation and validation conducted by Selekcija.hr and does not reproduce B5T test items.