International Journal of Psychology

Published Article

IJPBS-2026-5671F4

Personality Disorders – A Dimensional Approach

Prof. Khaled Ramadan Abdel-Fattah Suleiman

Professor of Mental Health – Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University, Egypt

Article type	Original Research
DOI	Not assigned
Volume / Issue / Year	Volume 1, Issue 1, 2026
Received	June 13, 2026
Revised	Not set
Accepted	June 13, 2026
Published	June 13, 2026

Article Metadata

Abstract

Personality disorders (PDs) have traditionally been conceptualized as categorical diagnoses within major diagnostic systems such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). However, growing empirical evidence suggests that dimensional models of personality pathology provide greater validity, reliability, and clinical utility. This paper presents an expanded analytical review of personality disorders from a dimensional perspective, emphasizing the limitations of categorical models and the advantages of trait-based frameworks. Drawing on contemporary psychometric theory, the Five-Factor Model (FFM), and the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders (DSM-5-AMPD), the study explores personality pathology as maladaptive extremes of normal personality traits. Clinical, neurobiological, and treatment implications are discussed, highlighting how dimensional models enhance diagnosis, case formulation, and personalized intervention.

Keywords

Personality Disorders; Dimensional Approach; Five-Factor Model; DSM-5-AMPD; Psychometrics; Clinical Assessment

Personality Disorders – A Dimensional Approach

Abstract

Personality disorders (PDs) have traditionally been conceptualized as categorical diagnoses within major diagnostic systems such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). However, growing empirical evidence suggests that dimensional models of personality pathology provide greater validity, reliability, and clinical utility. This paper presents an expanded analytical review of personality disorders from a dimensional perspective, emphasizing the limitations of categorical models and the advantages of trait-based frameworks. Drawing on contemporary psychometric theory, the Five-Factor Model (FFM), and the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders (DSM-5-AMPD), the study explores personality pathology as maladaptive extremes of normal personality traits. Clinical, neurobiological, and treatment implications are discussed, highlighting how dimensional models enhance diagnosis, case formulation, and personalized intervention.

Keywords

Personality Disorders; Dimensional Approach; Five-Factor Model; DSM-5-AMPD; Psychometrics; Clinical Assessment

1. Introduction

Personality disorders represent enduring patterns of inner experience and behavior that deviate markedly from cultural expectations, leading to significant distress and functional impairment. Epidemiological studies indicate that personality pathology contributes substantially to mental health burden, treatment resistance, and comorbidity across psychiatric conditions (Widiger & Samuel, 2005). Traditional categorical diagnostic systems conceptualize personality disorders as discrete entities. However, extensive empirical research has demonstrated that personality pathology is better understood as dimensional rather than categorical. Individuals rarely fit neatly into single diagnostic categories, and symptom overlap across disorders is common. The dimensional approach addresses these limitations by conceptualizing personality traits along continua ranging from adaptive to maladaptive functioning.

2. Limitations of Categorical Models

Categorical models, such as those employed in earlier DSM editions, face several well-documented limitations:

High comorbidity: Individuals frequently meet criteria for multiple personality disorders simultaneously.

Within-category heterogeneity: Patients with the same diagnosis often differ markedly in symptom presentation.

Arbitrary diagnostic thresholds: Categorical cutoffs fail to capture subthreshold pathology.

Poor temporal stability: Diagnoses often fluctuate over time despite the assumption of trait stability.

These limitations undermine diagnostic precision and complicate treatment planning. Dimensional models respond to these concerns by recognizing gradations of personality

pathology rather than binary presence–absence distinctions (Krueger & Eaton, 2010).

3. Dimensional Models of Personality

Dimensional models conceptualize personality traits as continuously distributed across the population. Maladaptive personality traits are understood as extreme or inflexible variants of normal traits. This approach aligns with modern psychometric theory, which emphasizes continuous latent variables rather than discrete categories. Dimensional models demonstrate superior reliability, predictive validity, and clinical relevance compared to categorical systems.

4. The Five-Factor Model (FFM)

The Five-Factor Model (Costa & McCrae, 1992) identifies five broad personality domains:

Neuroticism – emotional instability, negative affect

Extraversion – sociability, assertiveness

Openness to Experience – cognitive flexibility, curiosity

Agreeableness – empathy, cooperativeness

Conscientiousness – self-discipline, impulse control

From a dimensional perspective, personality disorders reflect maladaptive extremes of these traits. For example: high neuroticism combined with low agreeableness may correspond to borderline features; low agreeableness with low conscientiousness may relate to antisocial traits; and high extraversion with low agreeableness may reflect narcissistic tendencies. The FFM allows clinicians to describe personality pathology in precise, trait-based terms rather than relying only on global labels.

5. The DSM-5 Alternative Model for Personality Disorders (DSM-5-AMPD)

The DSM-5-AMPD represents a hybrid dimensional–categorical framework that incorporates Criterion A, which addresses severity of impairment in self and interpersonal functioning, and Criterion B, which focuses on pathological personality traits such as negative affectivity, antagonism, and disinhibition. This model conceptualizes personality disorders as varying in severity rather than type, emphasizing functional impairment and maladaptive trait expression. Empirical studies support its reliability and clinical utility (Skodol et al., 2011).

6. Clinical Implications for Diagnosis

Dimensional diagnosis enhances clinical assessment by identifying trait severity rather than relying solely on categorical labels, capturing subclinical pathology, and improving longitudinal monitoring of change. Clinicians can assess personality traits using validated instruments such as the NEO-PI-R and PID-5, providing a nuanced personality profile that guides treatment planning.

7. Dimensional Models and Treatment Planning

Dimensional models support personalized intervention by targeting specific maladaptive traits. High neuroticism may be addressed through emotion regulation and distress tolerance work, low conscientiousness through impulse control and behavioral planning, and low agreeableness through interpersonal skills and empathy training. Evidence-based therapies such as cognitive

behavioral therapy (CBT), dialectical behavior therapy (DBT), schema therapy, and mentalization-based treatment can be flexibly adapted to address these trait dimensions.

8. Personality Traits and Psychopathology

Personality traits function as vulnerability factors for various forms of psychopathology. High neuroticism predicts anxiety and mood disorders, while low conscientiousness is linked to substance use and impulsive behavior. Dimensional models clarify how personality traits interact with environmental stressors, contributing to the onset and maintenance of mental disorders.

9. Comorbidity and the Dimensional Perspective

Comorbidity is better understood through shared trait dimensions. For example, high negative affectivity underlies both borderline personality disorder and major depressive disorder. By focusing on common trait mechanisms, dimensional approaches promote integrated treatment strategies that address multiple disorders simultaneously.

10. Neurobiological Foundations of Dimensional Personality Traits

Neurobiological research supports the dimensional view of personality. Neuroticism is associated with heightened amygdala reactivity and stress sensitivity; conscientiousness relates to prefrontal cortex functioning and executive control; and agreeableness is linked to social cognition networks and empathy-related circuits. These findings suggest that personality traits reflect stable patterns of brain functioning rather than discrete disease entities.

11. Psychometric and Measurement Considerations

Dimensional assessment relies on reliable measurement tools, including the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5). These instruments demonstrate strong psychometric properties and facilitate dimensional diagnosis and outcome monitoring.

12. Limitations of Dimensional Models

Despite their advantages, dimensional models face challenges, including increased complexity in assessment, the need for clinician training, and ongoing refinement of trait thresholds. Nevertheless, these limitations are outweighed by gains in diagnostic precision and treatment relevance.

13. Future Directions

Future research should refine dimensional trait models, integrate genetic and neurobiological markers, examine treatment outcomes using trait-based formulations, and expand cross-cultural validation.

14. Conclusion

Personality disorders are best conceptualized as dimensional phenomena reflecting maladaptive extremes of normal personality traits. Dimensional models such as the Five-Factor Model and the DSM-5 Alternative Model for Personality Disorders provide superior explanatory power, diagnostic accuracy, and clinical utility. By embracing a dimensional perspective, clinicians and researchers can advance assessment, intervention, and understanding of personality pathology.

References (APA 7th Edition)

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Krueger, R. F., & Eaton, N. R. (2010). Personality traits and the classification of mental disorders. Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1(2), 97–118.

Skodol, A. E., Clark, L. A., Bender, D. S., Krueger, R. F., Livesley, W. J., Morey, L. C., & Oldham, J. M. (2011). Proposed changes in personality disorders classification for DSM-5. American Journal of Psychiatry, 168(9), 827–836.

Widiger, T. A., & Samuel, D. B. (2005). Diagnostic categories or dimensions? Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 114(4), 494–504.

Widiger, T. A., & Trull, T. J. (2007). Plate tectonics in the classification of personality disorder. American Psychologist, 62(2), 71–83.

File Compilation Report

File	Purpose	Status	Note
04_Blinded_Manuscript_Personality_Disorders_Dimensional_Approach.docx	Production source	Included	

Copyright and License

This article is published by International Journal of Psychology under CC BY 4.0.

ijp.international-journal.org