Literature Study of Cross-Cultural Size Comparisons Against Personality Traits

Charli Sitinjak
Esa Unggul University, Indonesia
Correspondent: charli.sitinjak@esaunggul.ac.id

ABSTRACT: After more than a century of research at the university, personality traits have been fully studied and measured, thanks to the work of many researchers. The Big Five is one of the most popular personality tests. It was created using an ethical approach, which says that personality traits should be measured in the same way in all cultures. But as the effects of different cultures grow and researchers learn more, ethical approaches to measuring personality are increasingly questioned. In anthropological research, emic approaches emphasizing the importance of specific cultural methods have been studied. This method is used to create the Big Six and Big Seven scales below. These measurements have been tested and found to be more accurate and valid for measuring personality traits in the right group of people. So, this study is intended to provide a literature review that summarizes how personality traits are defined, the specific content and development of such measurements using ethical and emic approaches, measurement problems based on relevant research, and several other things to think about. About when assessing personality traits using an etic and EMIC approach.

Keywords: Personality Traits, Big-Five, Ethical Approach, Emic Approach

INTRODUCTION

The concept of "personality" originated in anthropology around the middle of the nineteenth century. Most personality assessment studies begin with an attempt to lay out what scientists mean when they talk about "personality". Personality, as defined by Abood (2019), is a cyclical process of people's thinking, affective emotions, and observable behaviors. As the field of personality studies evolves, Church argues that a more holistic approach is needed to conceptualize personality constructs, which take into account the impact of different cultures (Chan et al., 2012; Choi et al., 2015). This led to the incorporation of other factors into the concept of personality, such as the quality of the disposition, the adaptation of personal characteristics, and the narrative of life in a cultural context. During a time when humans are trying to spell out what it means to be a person, many ethical scholars compare the qualities of human personality across cultures in an attempt to

better understand how one's cultural upbringing affects their own unique set of characters. This line of inquiry examines the invariant of cross-cultural personality structures to support the generalization of pre-existing Western personality models (Przepiorka et al., 2020).

A number of empirical studies show that the Big Five model is the most frequently used framework for measuring personality among cross-cultural researchers (Jankowsky et al., 2020; Rosenthal et al., 2015). The Big Five model has been widely accepted for being able to capture the universal personality elements that exist in all human civilizations, socioeconomic groups, and behavioral expressions. Although this model was developed to better understand the personality and behavior of the human being in the West, it has been criticized for its lack of cultural generalizations of its main traits. Because of this, emic methods have been used to construct various models of personality traits, such as the Big Six and Big Seven, which are more accurate representations of non-Western cultures. Researchers found that this model was highly correlated with the Big Five (Heine et al., 2008; Sung & Choi, 2012). However, researchers from different cultures have determined that the Big Five, Big Six, and Big Seven all have their own unique characteristics. In the previous section, the Emic Etic combined technique was demonstrated as another method of evaluating a person's character. The overarching goal of this strategy is to provide a universal and culturally specific framework in personality for researchers working across cultures. Combining ethical and emic techniques can improve people's global understanding of personality (Allik & Mccrae, 2004; Sung & Choi, 2012).

The literature that investigates and defines personality will be reviewed first. It can help us understand the many ways in which individuals understand their own personality. After finding further sources that exemplify ethical approaches in cross-cultural research and measurement of concerns surrounding these approaches, a further section will be undertaken. An important measurement framework emphasized in the ethical approach is the Big Five, Big Six (HEXACO), and Big Seven. The review paper ends with a summary and discussion of important factors to keep in mind while using ethical measurements to study personality structure.

METHOD

A Comprehensive Understanding of Personality Traits

According to the study of Mc Adams and Pals, a complete description of a person's life must consist of patterns of the nature of their disposition, processes of adaptive features, and life narratives that represent life in detail, all of which meet the evolutionary and cultural demands of the species (Heine et al., 2008; Schmitt, 2002). The Church defines four personality traits with unique values: developing universal human traits, character traits, characteristics, and life narratives (Reese et al., 2017). "Evolving universal human nature" emphasizes the primary requirements of the human being including survival, psychological well-being, and reproduction of species through the adjustment of needs, motives, influences, and the original mental system. "Dispositional attributes" describe personal differences across many domains. Extraversion and conscientiousness are thought to underlie the consistency of cultural behavior. Most personality psychologists view the quality of disposition as temperament or biological disposition.

"Characteristic adaptations" are mostly about goals, values, beliefs, or self-recognition that create other individual differences and can contribute through a process of interaction between underlying tendencies and external influences such as culture. Life narratives, the latter, describe how people's unique personal experiences or stories intertwine into their meaning, coherence, and life identity (Shrira et al., 2018).

Specifically, Heine & Buchtel (2009), affirms that different psychological points of view have different ways of conceptualizing a person's personality. He made the observation that those who study personality from a cross-cultural perspective, who are more likely to use ethical methods in their research, concentrate on dispositional traits and features . On the other hand, cultural psychologists who often take an emic approach to the study of personality place a strong emphasis on life narratives and character adaptations.

Personality Ethics Approach- Cross-Cultural Perspectives

Cross-cultural research focuses on comparing and contrasting dispositional traits and adaptive characteristics of individuals across different cultures. The researchers aim to identify cross-cultural or universal generalizations by comparing different cultures. The approach that cross-cultural researchers take is ethical, where cultures are considered relatively fixed and "outside" individuals (Lavine, 2009; McCrae, 2002; Schmitt et al., 2008). Traditional measurements are applied to measure personality traits, but often ignore the cultural context. In the last 30 years, many cross-cultural studies have emerged that use ethical approaches to highlight human personality traits that can be compared across different cultures (P. Jr. Costa et al., 2001).

In this regard, the studies of Van de Vijver and Leung became of great importance. Their ethical approach is designed to examine the feasibility and practicality of current personality constructions or measurements when they are exposed to a new cultural context. This approach compares basic structures, average levels, and correlations of personality constructs across cultures (Church, 2016; P. T. Costa et al., 2001; Kuckertz et al., 2020). By adopting an ethical approach, researchers can identify how personality traits vary between cultures and make comparisons more standard, which is important in making generalizations across cultures. Through this method, researchers can better understand how cultural factors shape an individual's personality and contribute to cross-cultural similarities and differences.

Big Five Models

The Big Five model, also known as the Five-Factor Model (FFM), is the most prominent example of an ethical approach in cross-cultural personality research. It is a structure consisting of five broad personality domains - Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness (Feher & Vernon, 2021; Holt et al., 2017). FFM has received a broad consensus from international personality researchers, and many agree that its structure has to do with basic human biological tendencies. By excluding cultural elements, FFM can describe personality in all cultures (Dan et al., 2021).

Church's article aligns with the idea that the properties of disposition are biological to some extent, and not just cultural products (Church, 2016). Dan et al.'s research (2021), further supports the

usefulness of FFM in measuring personality in different countries and ethnic groups, showing that personalities are cross-culturally equal to some extent. Studies conducted in Japan, Germany, and Canada have confirmed the idea of universal FFM and its relation to genotypes. In addition, sex differences in personality traits have been noted in 56 cultures through self-report measurements, with women generally having higher levels of Neuroticism and Agreeableness. These findings suggest that FFM is a reliable and practical model for describing and assessing personality.

In addition, the Big Five traits have been associated with a variety of psychological outcomes, including work performance, satisfaction in personal relationships, leadership, educational outcomes, internet pleasure, and health conditions. This shows the significant influence that FFM has on human life (Baker et al., 2021; Hamza & Arif, 2019; Lee, 2018). The existence and universality of FFM has been proven in more than 50 societies on different continents. The reliability and practicality of FFM has led many personality and cross-cultural researchers to advocate this model as a basic framework for describing and assessing personality (Guilera et al., 2019; Hamza & Arif, 2019).

According to Kajonius and Mac Giolla's article, FFM has been investigated in different countries and languages using the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) Revision or the BIG Five Inventory (BFI) [1]. Marsh alstudy . details many other instruments used to measure personality traits, one of which is known as the NEO instrument family, which includes a scale of 60 NEO-Five Factor items (Holt et al., 2017). Many researchers use these instruments, and they have attracted a lot of attention.

The Big Five model, or FFM, has gained significant support from personality researchers, but some concerns have been raised about its universality. One of the main concerns is that FFM overestimates its universality, and the five properties contained in it are not always replicable in all circumstances. This problem arises when researchers measure personality traits using FFM as the main framework. The lack of universality in FFM was demonstrated by Cabrera-Paniagua & Rubilar-Torrealba (2021), when they tested FFM on natives and illiterates in Tsimane. They found that only two of the five traits, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, could be realized and argued that these two traits tended to reflect socioecological characteristics in small societies. They propose that personality factors are limited by the level of education and the characteristics of the targeted sample, such as wealth or poverty.

Another problem is that other personality traits that are not included in FFM are excluded, which limits the ability to fully understand human personality traits. Traits such as Honesty-Humility in the Big Six Model and Negative and Positive Valence are examples of traits outside the FFM structure. These emerging traits suggest that the structure of FFM is not enough to fully understand the complexity of the human personality. For example, in China, Openness is not found to be a prominent personality dimension in many cross-border studies. Therefore, it is very important to consider the limitations of FFM in cross-cultural personality research and explore the role of other personality traits that arise in different cultural contexts (Lin et al., 2019; Mangiavacchi et al., 2021; Rosenthal et al., 2015).

In conclusion, while FFM is widely accepted as a fundamental framework for describing and assessing personality, concerns around its universality and the exclusion of other personality traits outside the FFM structure cannot be ignored. Researchers need to acknowledge the limitations of FFM and consider the broader context of personality traits to gain a more comprehensive understanding of human personality.

Big Six (HEXACO) Model and Big Seven Model

Feher and Vernon developed HEXACO, a six-factor personality model, using an ethical approach and applying it in other countries (Chan et al., 2012). Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness, Emotionality, and Honesty-Humility make up HEXACO. Many cross-cultural studies highlight an element of the sixth trait, Honesty-Humility. Honesty-Humility relates to fairness and decency in some cultures. This model of personality traits is also measured [4]. Ashton and Lee note that while some components of HEXACO, such as Agreeableness and Emotionally, differ from FFM, there is a high association between the comparable characteristics of HEXACO and the Big Five, such as Openness (Chan et al., 2012; Choi et al., 2015). Big Five Agreeableness and HEXACO Honesty Humility are positively correlated. Choi et al. (2015), found that the correlation of the FFM and Big Six models ranged from 0.52 to 0.87, while the correlation between Honesty, Humility, and Agreeableness was almost 0.07. Despite their similarities, HEXACO is more predictive than BBF in many categories, including psychopathic tendencies, risk-taking, power aspirations, and commercial decisions.

Almagor et al. conducted several empirical studies that revealed the presence of seven high-level factors. These researchers found that the five factors in the Big Seven model were somewhat similar, but not identical to those in FFM. The seven factors include Negative Emotions, Positive Emotions (which are similar to Neuroticism and Extraversion in FFM, respectively), Agreeableness, Dependability (which is similar to Conventionality in FFM), Unconventionality (which is similar to Openness in FFM), Positive Valence (PV), and Negative Valence (NV) (Chan et al., 2012; Choi et al., 2015; Przepiorka et al., 2020). PV and NV are two new factors that represent a very positive and negative self-evaluation, respectively. Within decades of creating the Big Seven Model inventory, many personality researchers discovered similar seven-factor models in various cultural and linguistic samples, such as Hebrew, Spanish, and Tagalog. Although the resulting seven-factor structure is not entirely identical, all identify similar PV and NV factors found in the original work of Lin et al. (2019).

The Issue of Measurement in Ethical Approaches.

Although this inventory of ethical personalities has been widely applied, there are still some measurement issues. First, the source of cross-cultural research bias is found to be more than the bias that can be detected by applicable equality procedures. There are three sources of bias: constructs, methods, and items. Some researchers note that all personality constructs have been formed in Western countries. Thus, the transport of this measurement of personality to non-Western cultures such as Asian cultures (for example, the understanding of the Openness factor between different Western and Eastern countries) will have a construct bias. Method bias is mainly caused by systematic distortions (i.e. different response forces) (Sung & Choi, 2012). Although

Harzing identified stable cross-cultural response style differences in 26 countries, those types of differences should be further researched in future research. At the item level, bias is often found during the test adaptation process when an item written in one culture is difficult to apply to another culture (Heine et al., 2008). According to the research of Schimitt (2002), many advanced tools are developed and used in finding item biases.

The gap between substantive theories relating to differences in personality structure and equality of personality models, as well as the accompanying inventory, is the second methodological problem with ethical personality instruments (for example, FFM and NEO-PI-R). The current paradigm of cross-cultural personality differences is rather simple, and most of them only emphasize the difference in average scores (Reese et al., 2017). Also, as noted in an article written by Church, some research has just summarized personality differences across cultures by comparing personality traits at an average level across different cultures. However, McCrae et al. (2004), found that there was only a moderate relationship between the average personality profile and the national personality profile.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the information provided earlier, there are two further considerations that can be taken to refine the ethical personality model in order to better capture cross-cultural personality traits. First, researchers should pay attention to the generalization of ethical personality models when conducting cross-cultural research. As mentioned earlier, these models are mainly established in Western countries, and therefore, it is important to consider whether these models can be replicated in other countries or cultures. As noted by Feher and Vernon, the ability of this model to capture components in non-Western contexts is weak. As a result, exploring other personality traits or components outside of existing ethical models is invaluable. For example, the "Interpersonal Linkage" factor was discovered during the study of Chinese personality traits. It is also important to increase the diversity of samples when testing this personality model. By including people with diverse characteristics, not just those who are highly educated, relatively wealthy, urban, and from a Western sample, the universality of this ethical personality model can be better ascertained.

To support the development of an ethical personality model, a useful approach is needed. The emic approach is a valuable way to capture the unique construction of personality traits in non-Western cultures. The main contribution of the emic approach in personality research is the identification of personality traits that are prioritized during the learning process of thought and behavior in a particular culture. Many researchers have proposed a combination of etic and emic approaches in studying personality traits. The main objective of this integration is to bridge the gap between the mainstream personality model and the indigenous component, as well as provide a comprehensive framework in the personality dimension.

The emic approach is particularly useful in identifying culturally specific personality traits, which ethical models may not take into account. This approach helps build an understanding of how personality traits manifest in a particular culture. Using ethical and emic approaches, researchers

can build a more nuanced understanding of the cultural diversity of personality traits. The emic approach allows researchers to examine how cultural factors contribute to the development of personality traits, while the ethical approach provides a framework for comparing and contrasting personality traits across cultures.

In conclusion, it is important for researchers to be aware of the limitations of ethical personality models when conducting cross-cultural research. By combining ethical and emic approaches, researchers can develop a more comprehensive understanding of cross-cultural personality traits. By increasing the diversity of samples and exploring other personality traits or components beyond existing ethical models, researchers can ascertain the universality of those personality models. The use of the emic approach in personality research provides valuable insight into how personality traits are expressed in different cultural contexts.

The second consideration is the level of measurement. Several types of bias are present in personality measurement, as discussed in the ethical personality measurement section. Fortunately, some equivalent or invariant processes, such as conceptual equivalence, linguistic equivalence, and measurement equivalence, are designed to reverse bias. Vandenberg and Lance argue that exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) are superior methods for ensuring measurement equivalence (P. T. Costa et al., 2001; Jiang, 2021). Tongwane & Moeletsi (2021), reports that CFA fails to support FFM and its inventory (e.g., NEO instruments), whereas EFA consistently identifies Big Five factors. These limitations in statistical techniques have prompted many academics to challenge the structure of the Big Five measurement levels and other comparable models (P. Jr. Costa et al., 2001; Heine et al., 2008; Sung & Choi, 2012).

CONCLUSION

Previous studies have shown that ethical approaches are popular and important when it comes to conceptualizing personality traits across different cultural contexts. Some well-known personality models, such as the Five Factor Model (FFM), the Big Six Model (Big Six), and the Big Seven Model (Big Seven), have undergone several refinements as a result of the implementation of different countries. Even though this personality model is becoming less popular around the world, there are still concerns over its universality and capacity to imitate. In addition, there are still biases and inequalities in its measurements. As a result, recommendations for a combined ethical-emic approach and increased dependence on CFA are offered to improve measurement equivalence in the field of personality research.

REFERENCE

Abood, N. (2019). Big five traits: A critical review. In Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business (Vol. 21, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.34931

Allik, J., & Mccrae, R. R. (2004). Toward a Geography of Personality Traits: Patterns of Profiles across 36 Cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022103260382

Baker, H. K., Kumar, S., & Goyal, N. (2021). Personality traits and investor sentiment. Review of Behavioral Finance, 13(4). https://doi.org/10.1108/RBF-08-2017-0077

Cabrera-Paniagua, D., & Rubilar-Torrealba, R. (2021). A novel artificial autonomous system for supporting investment decisions using a Big Five model approach. Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2020.104107

Chan, W., McCrae, R. R., de Fruyt, F., Jussim, L., Löckenhoff, C. E., de Bolle, M., Costa, P. T., Sutin, A. R., Realo, A., Allik, J., Nakazato, K., Shimonaka, Y., Hřebíčková, M., Graf, S., Yik, M., Brunner-Sciarra, M., de Figueora, N. L., Schmidt, V., Ahn, C. kyu, ... Terracciano, A. (2012). Stereotypes of age differences in personality traits: Universal and accurate? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103(6). https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029712

Choi, D., Oh, I. S., & Colbert, A. E. (2015). Understanding organizational commitment: A meta-analytic examination of the roles of the five-factor model of personality and culture. Journal of Applied Psychology, 100(5). https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000014

Church, A. T. (2016). Personality traits across cultures. In Current Opinion in Psychology (Vol. 8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.014

Costa, P. Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(2). https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.81.2.322

Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(2). https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322

And, Y., Ahmed, A. A. A., Chupradit, S., Chupradit, P. W., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2021). The Nexus Between the Big Five Personality Traits Model of the Digital Economy and Blockchain Technology Influencing Organization Psychology. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.780527

Feher, A., & Vernon, P. A. (2021). Looking beyond the Big Five: A selective review of alternatives to the Big Five model of personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110002

Guilera, T., Batalla, I., Forné, C., & Soler-González, J. (2019). Empathy and big five personality model in medical students and its relationship to gender and specialty preference: A cross-sectional study. BMC Medical Education, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1485-2

Hamza, N., & Arif, I. (2019). Impact of Financial Literacy on Investment Decisions: The Mediating Effect of Big-Five Personality Traits Model | Market Forces. Market Forces Research Journal , 14(1).

Heine, S. J., & Buchtel, E. E. (2009). Personality: The universal and the culturally specific. In Annual Review of Psychology (Vol. 60). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163655

Heine, S. J., Buchtel, E. E., & Norenzayan, A. (2008). What do cross-national comparisons of personality traits tell us? The case of conscientiousness: Research report. Psychological Science, 19(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02085.x

Holt, T., Burke-Smalley, L. A., & Jones, C. (2017). An empirical investigation of student career interests in auditing using the Big Five model of personality. In Advances in Accounting Education: Teaching and Curriculum Innovations (Vol. 20). https://doi.org/10.1108/S1085-462220170000020002

Jankowsky, K., Olaru, G., & Schroeders, U. (2020). Compiling Measurement Invariant Short Scales in Cross-Cultural Personality Assessment Using Ant Colony Optimization. European Journal of Personality, 34(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2260

Jiang, K. (2021). Literature Review of Measurements of Personality Traits across Cultures. Journal of Psychological Research, 3(4). https://doi.org/10.30564/jpr.v3i4.3838

Kuckertz, A., Berger, E. S. C., & Prochotta, A. (2020). Misperception of entrepreneurship and its consequences for the perception of entrepreneurial failure – the German case. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 26(8). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-02-2020-0060

Lavine, R. A. (2009). Personality Traits Across Cultures and Research on Obedience. In American Psychologist (Vol. 64, Issue 7). https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017285

Lee, T. C. (2018). Can Xi Jinping be the next Mao Zedong? Using the Big Five Model to Study Political Leadership. Journal of Chinese Political Science, 23(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11366-018-9540-0

Lin, W., Ortega, D. L., Caputo, V., & Lusk, J. L. (2019). Personality traits and consumer acceptance of controversial food technology: A cross-country investigation of genetically modified animal products. Food Quality and Preference, 76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.03.007

Mangiavacchi, L., Piccoli, L., & Rapallini, C. (2021). Personality Traits and Household Consumption Choices. B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy, 21(2). https://doi.org/10.1515/bejeap-2020-0189

McCrae, R. R. (2002). Cross-Cultural Research on the Five-Factor Model of Personality. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 4(4). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1038

McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Ȟrebíčková, M., Urbánek, T., Martin, T. A., Oryol, V. E., Rukavishnikov, A. A., & Monday, I. G. (2004). Age differences in personality traits across cultures: Self-report and observer perspectives. In European Journal of Personality (Vol. 18, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1002/per.510

Przepiorka, A., Siu, N. Y. fan, Szcześniak, M., Timoszyk-Tomczak, C., Le, J. J., & Muñoz, M. P. (2020). The Relation Between Personality, Time Perspective and Positive Orientation in Chile, Hong Kong, and Poland. Journal of Happiness Studies, 21(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00113-x

Reese, E., Myftari, E., McAnally, H. M., Chen, Y., Neha, T., Wang, Q., Jack, F., & Robertson, S. J. (2017). Telling the tale and living well: Adolescent narrative identity, personality traits, and well-being across cultures. Child Development, 88(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12618

Rosenthal, M., Hall, K. W., Bussières, J. F., & Tsuyuki, R. T. (2015). Professional culture and personality traits of hospital pharmacists across Canada: A fundamental first step in developing effective knowledge translation strategies. Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 68(2). https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i2.1438

Schmitt, D. P. (2002). Are Sexual Promiscuity and Relationship Infidelity Linked to Different Personality Traits Across Cultures? Findings from the International Sexuality Description Project. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 4(4). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1041

Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why Can't a Man Be More Like a Woman? Sex Differences in Big Five Personality Traits Across 55 Cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94(1). https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.168

Shrira, I., Wisman, A., & Noguchi, K. (2018). Diversity of historical ancestry and personality traits across 56 cultures. Personality and Individual Differences, 128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.02.013

Sung, Y., & Choi, S. M. (2012). The influence of self-construal on self-brand congruity in the United States and Korea. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110383318

Tongwane, M. I., & Moeletsi, M. E. (2021). Status of electric vehicles in South Africa and their carbon mitigation potential. Scientific African, 14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2021.e00999