Management Department Journal Articles

Management Faculty Publications and Research

8-19-2022

Personality Research in the 21st Century: New Developments and Directions for the Field

Michele N. Medina-Craven
Mississippi State University

Kathryn Ostermeier
Bryant University, kostermeier@bryant.edu

Pratigya Sigdyal
California State University, Bakersfield

Benjamin David McLarty
Mississippi State University

Recommended Citation

Personality Research in the 21st Century: New Developments and Directions for the Field

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Personality Research in the 21st Century: New Developments and Directions for the Field

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this review is to systematically examine and classify the multitude of personality traits that have emerged in the literature beyond the Big Five (Five Factor Model) since the turn of the 21st century. We argue this represents a new phase of personality research that is characterized both by construct proliferation and a movement away from the Big Five and demonstrates how personality as a construct has substantially evolved in the 21st century.

Design/methodology/approach – We conducted a comprehensive, systematic review of personality research from 2000-2020 across 17 management and psychology journals. This search yielded 1,901 articles of which 440 were relevant and subsequently coded for this review.

Findings – Our review uncovers 155 traits, beyond the Big Five, that have been explored, which we organize and analyze into 10 distinct categories. Each category comprises a definition, lists the included traits, and highlights an exemplar construct. We also specify the significant research outcomes associated with each trait category.

Originality – The review categorizes the 155 personality traits that have emerged in the management and psychology literatures that describe personality beyond the Big Five. Based on these findings, we propose new avenues for future research and offer insights into the future of the field as the concept of personality has shifted in the 21st century.

Keywords: Personality, Systematic literature review, Traits

Personality Research in the 21st Century: New Developments and Directions for the Field

Personality remains one of the most studied topics within both organizational behavior and psychology, with scholars publishing on the subject for over a century. In recent decades, the Big Five (or Five Factor Model) of personality has dominated the personality literature (Barrick and Mount, 1991) as scholars have focused their efforts onto a framework that helps them understand personality in a manner that is useful and relevant across contexts and cultures (McCrae and John, 1992). Yet, in the 21st century, researchers began to move away from a strict focus on the Big Five when investigating various workplace phenomena. As a result, we contend that personality research has entered a new era, marked by investigations of different personality traits and individual differences.

Particularly since the year 2000 these advancements have moved the field of personality research in interesting new directions. Whereas this dispersion is a credit to the wide interest in personality and individual differences research by scholars across numerous disciplines, challenges arise for researchers to identify and understand all of these advancements. To address this issue, we conducted a comprehensive, systematic review of the personality literature across management and psychology journals. Due to the volume of research on personality traits, we chose to focus our review on personality traits beyond those of the Big Five that have been studied during the first two decades of the 2000s. We do this to highlight the newer, underexamined personality traits that have emerged in this timeframe and that can provide new insights for personality scholars and demonstrate the historical development of personality as a research construct in the 21st century. Moreover, we categorize these traits into 10 different themes, each with corresponding outcomes. Thus, our review seeks to help classify the multitude of traits that have been examined in the new millennium—not to replace the Big Five—but to

complement them and help further advance personality research. Additionally, classification is at the heart of our systematic review and our aim is to organize and categorize the traits, to integrate disparate literatures, and to provide a new way of viewing traits rather than to identify the mechanisms by which these traits influence their corresponding outcomes. Lastly, we conclude our review with suggestions for scholars interested in researching personality traits and with proposed avenues for future research. We first provide a brief review of personality research and its two established phases – and present a case for why we contend that the field has advanced to a third phase of personality research, thereby necessitating a new, systematic review of the field.

Overview of Previous Phases of Personality Research

Over time, constructs go through various changes, with the relevance of management research being reevaluated over a 140-year span (Wood *et al.*, 2022), and changes within the management literature (Pollach, 2022) being no different when it comes to how constructs are viewed. Indeed, some concepts become more focused, such as performance management which in the last 20 years, has undergone a change from firms conducting a once or twice a year evaluation to having "forward-looking, feedback-enriched" systems (Justin and Joy, 2022, p. 428). Concepts can also be influenced by various periods of history. For example, Bendickson *et al.* (2016) explored how four main areas within management history influenced the development of agency theory's core tenets. Concepts also decline in their usefulness over time. Zoller and Muldoon (2020) show this by investigating how span of control, which dominated the management literature in the 1970s, has steadily declined as research in the management field became more scientific in nature. Indeed, as these studies demonstrate, there is value in examining constructs and how they evolve over time.

Similarly, personality, one of the most studied constructs in management research, has also evolved over the years as researchers have attempted to focus their efforts on understanding how this construct is relevant in organizational settings. Personality refers to the structures and propensities that reflect or explain characteristic patterns of an individual's thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (Funder, 2001). Barrick *et al.* (2001) divided personality research into two phases. In Phase 1, occurring between the 1900s and the 1980s, investigators evaluated the relationships of individual scales from numerous personality inventories to various aspects of job performance. The conclusion from this phase was that personality and job performance were not related in any meaningful way across traits and situations. Moreover, as suggested in Guion and Gottier's (1965) review: there is no evidence that personality measures are good tools for employee selection. This view of personality remained unchallenged for the next 25 years.

Phase 2, beginning in the mid-1980s, is characterized by the use of the Big Five or the Five Factor Model (FFM) or some variant thereof (Barrick *et al.*, 2001). The use of meta-analyses also increased during this time to summarize results quantitatively across studies. Over 15 meta-analytic studies examined the personality-performance relationship, which led to more optimistic conclusions than in the prior phase (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Tett *et al.*, 1991). In fact, Guion (1998) reversed course from earlier conclusions (in Phase 1) about the usefulness of personality and stated that at least some aspects of it are related to job performance. Barrick *et al.* (2001) contend that this phase continues until the present. We contend, however, that personality is in now a third phase, beginning around the turn of the 21st century, in which scholars focus on constructs that offer an alternative perspective on personality.

Personality Research Since 2000 (Phase 3)

In the new millennia, researchers began to take a different perspective on personality. Specifically, researchers began to identify other kinds of personality traits beyond the Big Five. It is this phase of personality research exploring beyond the Big Five that is the focus of the present review.

[Table I about here]

Methodology of Review

To identify articles to examine for our review, we first determined the parameters for our search. We reviewed publications across 21 years, from 2000 to 2020. To identify new personality constructs that have emerged and been studied in the new millennium, we searched for two terms ("personality" and "trait") in either the title, abstract, or keywords, in 17 top management and psychology journals (see Table I). To identify these journals, we first referenced popular journal lists, including the Association of Business Schools (ABS), the Financial Times 50 (FT50), and the Australian Business Dean's Council (ABDC) lists. From the ABS list, we identified journals from general management, organizational studies, psychology (general and organizational) that were ranked a 4*, 4, or 3, resulting in 66 different journals. From the FT50 list, we identified those journals which were related to management, yielding 14 journals. From the ABDC list, we narrowed down our search to include management journals (area 1503 from the list), and journals which were ranked as A*, as well as searching for journals which contained "personality" in their title, regardless of its place on the journal list, resulting in 62 journal titles. To be included in the review, we identified those journals which appeared on two or more of the lists, those which contained "personality" in the title of the journal, and those which contained empirical articles.

Ultimately, this resulted in a review of 17 journals. Using a combination of an

EBSCOhost search and searching through the journal archives themselves for the two keywords,

our search within these 17 journals resulted in 1,901 total articles, 440 of which were relevant to

our personality review. Articles were excluded from our review for several reasons, such as:

focusing only on the Big Five (including a facet-level approach), pertaining to a field outside of

management or psychology (e.g., marketing), using personality as a theory rather than a

construct, using personality as a state or attitude rather than a trait, using personality only as a

statistical control variable, and being a meta-analysis or review, among others. Moreover, we

assessed how the personality trait was operationalized; in other words, manuscripts were

excluded from our coding if the operationalization did not correspond to the conceptual

definition of personality, which we define as *structures and propensities that reflect or explain*

characteristic patterns of an individual's thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (cf. Funder, 2001).

[Tables II & III about here]

Personality Constructs of the New Millennium

Our review of these 440 articles yielded 154 distinct personality characteristics and traits,

which we organized into 10 categorizes. To create the 10 categories and classify the traits into

each category, the author team independently (four individual personality researchers) grouped

the traits into groups based upon similarity of the trait definitions and focus of the traits. Next,

the author team together compared our findings and generated a list of agreed-up categories and

the included traits. Table II provides an overview of the personality traits that have been studied

from 2000 to 2020, beyond the Big Five, including exemplar citations for authors that have

explored these constructs. Table III identifies the outcomes that emerged from each of these 10

categories and selected citations of work in these areas. These categories are discussed below in more detail.

Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits

Career, performance, and work-oriented traits involve those personality traits which directly involve an individual's career and work-life, including performance-related traits and leader-specific traits. There are 32 traits in this category. A trait that illustrates this category is protean career orientation, which refers to a relatively stable career preference which values self-directedness and defines career success according to the person's personal values (Baruch *et al.*, 2005). Protean career orientation was found to predict career behaviors and career satisfaction (Herrman *et al.*, 2015). A commonly studied trait within this category is creative personality, which is an antecedent of firm performance (Gong *et al.*, 2013). However, a lesser known trait to predict performance is growth need strength, which is defined as "an individual's desire to grow and develop within his/her job" (Shalley *et al.*, 2009, p. 489), and is related to intrinsic motivation, but distinct in that those individuals desire to learn new things, push themselves, and improve in their job, regardless of whether they are interested in or enjoy their work (Shalley *et al.*, 2009). This trait might hold interest for personality scholars interested what innately motivates and compels individuals to succeed in their job. It would be interesting to explore this trait in the context of "dark" or abusive environments and to examine this in the team context.

This category also included organizational personality traits (the personality of the organization, i.e., Slaughter *et al.*, 2004) – highlighting an important movement by looking at personality at more than just the individual or team level (Schneider and Bartram, 2017). Holistically, the outcomes for this category are job-related and typically studied outcomes in management, including individual and team performance outcomes, such as creative

performance (growth need strength; Shalley *et al.*, 2009), job performance (PALS; Tews *et al.*, 2011), and team task performance (leader goal orientation; Porter *et al.*, 2016). Career-specific outcomes, such as career satisfaction (protean career orientation; Herrman *et al.*, 2015), specialty choice for doctors (abstractedness; Borges and Osmon, 2001), and management advancement (managerial aspirations; Tharenou, 2001) were also common. Lastly, these personality traits have been linked to organizational-level outcomes, including organizational attractiveness (organizational personality; Slaughter *et al.*, 2004), strategic decision outcomes (cognitive style; Hough and Ogilvie, 2005), and venture growth (passion for work; Baum and Locke, 2004).

Dark Side Traits

The dark side traits involve personality characteristics that are generally viewed to be negative or destructive to both individuals that possess them and those surrounding them (Spain *et al.*, 2014). In total, 12 traits emerged that fit this category, and, from our review, the Dark Triad (DT) traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) emerged as the most common. Narcissism, as the most commonly studied trait in our review, has been explored through more narrow iterations such as CEO narcissism (Gerstner *et al.*, 2013), CEO grandiose narcissism (Reina *et al.*, 2014), and sexual narcissism (Day *et al.*, 2017). Interested scholars might also consider some of the other unique traits that emerged in this category such as temptation. Temptation is an individual difference that includes five factors – desire for obtaining wealth, impulsive behavior, cognitive impairment, social moral values, and a lack of self-control (Chen *et al.*, 2014). Temptation has interesting applications for management researchers as it has some conceptual similarities to the DT but might be less subject to social desirability. Overall, the traits in this category tended to be linked to negative outcomes such as unethical behaviors (e.g., Machiavellianism; Greenbaum *et al.*, 2017), dyad aggression level

(e.g., trait aggression; Anderson *et al.*, 2008), and state hostility (e.g., trait hostility; Lindsay and Anderson, 2000). It was less common for these dark traits to be studied as predictors of positive outcomes, although there are notable exceptions (e.g., innovative performance, Zhang *et al.*, 2017; and presidential performance, Lilienfeld *et al.*, 2012), thereby warranting future research.

Emotionality and Trait Emotions

Emotionality and trait emotions describe those traits which concern emotional expression or emotions which are operationalized as traits. Overall, 11 traits arose in this category. Two popular traits within this category are positive and negative affectivity. While these two traits have been linked to outcomes, including mood (Judge and Ilies, 2004), creative performance (Gilmore *et al.*, 2013), and concern for others or self (Rhoades *et al.*, 2001), scholars might be interested in exploring the similar, but less well-known, constructs of positive and negative emotionality (Tellegen, 1982). Individuals with high positive emotionality are predisposed to be actively engaged with their environments and to experience positive emotions such as enthusiasm and zest. In contrast, individuals with high negative emotionality tend to experience more negative emotions, such as anxiety and resentment (Shiner *et al.*, 2002). Overall, the constructs in this category were linked to a wide variety of outcomes including marital dissatisfaction (e.g., trait anxiety; Caughlin *et al.*, 2000), discrimination legal claims (e.g., trait anger; Goldman, 2003), probability of having children (e.g., emotionality; Jokela *et al.*, 2009), and transformational leadership (e.g., emotional intelligence; Rubin *et al.*, 2005). The diversity of these outcomes can be explained by the demarcation between the outcomes studied in psychology (especially social psychology) journals and management journals.

Fortitude and Strength Traits

The fortitude and strength traits involve those personality traits which represent an individual's mental strength and tendency to persevere in difficult situations. These 10 traits focus on capabilities that enables individuals to stand up for themselves in front of others or in the face of difficult situations. A trait in this category that has recently received attention in the public eye is grit (Duckworth *et al.*, 2007). Another related trait is tenacity, which involves sustaining goal-directed action, even when faced with obstacles (Baum and Locke, 2004). Tenacity has important implications for organizations as it has tangible outcomes (e.g., venture growth; Baum and Locke, 2004). Holistically, traits in this category have been linked with positive, success-oriented outcomes, including goal attainment (grit; Sheldon *et al.*, 2015), extrinsic career success (self-control; Converse *et al.*, 2012), and life satisfaction (core confidence; Stajkovic *et al.*, 2015). Overall, the traits within this category were the least explored, providing ample opportunity to scholars interested in the outcomes associated with these "tough" traits and in the contexts in which these traits flourish or wither.

Light Side Traits

The light side traits involve those personality traits which are generally viewed as positive or beneficial. A total of 12 traits emerged in this category. The most dominant trait in this category is proactive personality. Over 35 studies from our review explored proactive personality, which influenced various outcomes, including thriving at work (Jiang, 2017), team innovative performance (Chen *et al.*, 2013), taking charge behavior (Fuller *et al.*, 2012), and trust (Gong *et al.*, 2012). An interesting trait that emerged was that of curiosity and all its iterations (epistemic, Mussel, 2013; specific and divertive, Harrison *et al.*, 2011). Curiosity refers to a desire for new information that stimulates inquisitive and exploratory behaviors (Berlyne, 1966).

As one would presume, most of the outcomes in this category are also beneficial, such as affective organizational commitment (proactive personality; Chan, 2006), whistleblowing (self-efficacy; MacNab and Worthley, 2008), and career exploration (hope; Hirschi *et al.*, 2015). Yet, the relationships between these positive traits and positive outcomes are not straightforward, as scholars have investigated to role of CEO gender, the traits expressed (communal vs. agentic), and company profits (Pillemer *et al.*, 2014). This illustrates an important trend in personality research, where "obvious" relationships are receiving more scrutiny.

Morality Traits

Morality traits involve an individual's treatment of others and their moral character, which include 11 unique traits. The most researched of these traits was that of honesty-humility from HEXACO (Lee and Ashton, 2004). Outcomes of honesty-humility include prosocial behavior (Hilbig *et al.*, 2014) and ethical leadership (de Vries, 2012). An emerging trait in this category is modesty, which refers to a stable personality characteristic that involves individuals' thoughts and feelings about themselves in comparison to other people (Chen *et al.*, 2009). Holistically, morality traits are useful in predicting ethical outcomes and are valuable to scholars interested in why some individuals engage in ethical behaviors while others do not. While ethical outcomes are common in management research, our review revealed that morality traits are currently underutilized. Thus, we contend that scholars who are interested in organizational ethics should consider including some relevant morality traits in their research, as they might explain additional variance in ethical outcomes.

Outlook Traits

Outlook traits reflect how individuals view or approach the world – either positively or negatively. This category, which included 22 traits, contained some of the most unique traits in

our review, such as zest, xenophilia, and equity sensitivity. Zest is a positive trait which reflects a

person's approach to life with anticipation, energy, and excitement with high levels being

associated with higher life satisfaction (Peterson *et al.*, 2009). Xenophilia, the opposite of

xenophobia, involves an attraction to foreign people, cultures, or customs that manifests itself in

curiosity and hospitality toward foreigners and benevolent cross-cultural exploration (Antweiler,

2009). Those who exhibited high levels of xenophilia were more likely to engage in habitual

cross-cultural exploration and influenced their attitudes toward indigenous people (Sturmer *et*

al., 2013). Equity sensitivity is a trait that explains differences in individual reactions to inequity,

with those high in equity sensitivity wanting more than others for a given level of input (Sauley

and Bedeian, 2000). Additionally, a well-known trait within this category is locus of control.

Scholars interested in this trait might likewise be interested in the less explored trait of

psychological empowerment, which refers to a form of intrinsic motivation, which manifests in

four dimensions – meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Newman *et al.*, 2017).

Holistically, the outcomes of this category are diverse, given the multiple types of outlooks that

exist. Examples of outcomes in this category include moral disengagement (e.g., cynicism;

Detert *et al.*, 2008), view of work as a calling (e.g., zest; Peterson *et al.*, 2009), and career

indecision (e.g., pessimism; Braunstein-Bercovitz *et al.*, 2012). These diverse set of traits have

potential implications for organizations that have been underexplored, proving an opportunity for

personality researchers.

Inclinations

This theme involves traits that reflect an individual's inclinations, with 12 traits emerging

in this category. Some of these traits include activity (expressed as energetic and vigorous

behavior in daily routines; Buss and Plomin, 1984), preference for solitude (Long *et al.*, 2003),

self-verification striving (the tendency for individuals to promote the survival of their self-conceptions, regardless of whether they are positive or negative; Swann, 1987), and willingness to communicate (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987). This category predicts a wide range of outcomes, from personal to professional. For example, high activity in men was found to increase the probability of having children (Jokela *et al.*, 2009). Willingness to communicate directly influences an individual's likelihood of speaking up (i.e., voice; Kumar and Mishra, 2017). Meanwhile self-verification striving was linked to newcomer performance (Cable and Kay, 2012). These traits also influence job search behavior (procrastination; van Hooft *et al.*, 2005) and are associated with cognitive ability (tidiness; Major *et al.*, 2014).

Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits

This category includes traits that reflect how individuals act around others and in social situations, and includes 20 traits. The most dominant trait in this category was self-monitoring, which has been linked to numerous outcomes such as workplace performance (Mehra *et al.*, 2001), rating and decision accuracy (Jawahar, 2001), and friendship (Sasovova *et al.*, 2010). An emergent trait in this category is blirtatiousness, which refers to the disinhibition of verbal expression (Swann and Rentfrow, 2001). High blirters tend to "blurt out" their thoughts as they are thinking them in contrast to being slow to respond. Others see them as more intelligent, likeable, and attractive (Swann and Rentfrow, 2001). Additional outcomes for this category include advancement potential (e.g., team-oriented proactivity; Hirschfeld *et al.*, 2011), group member performance (e.g., psychological collectivism; Jackson *et al.*, 2006), and the propensity to mentor others (e.g., prosocial personality; Allen, 2003).

Well-Being and Self-View Traits

The well-being and self-view traits reflect both how individuals view their inner world and their overall well-being. With 13 traits in this category, outcomes range from popularity (e.g., CSE; Scott and Judge, 2009) to work-family balance (e.g., mindfulness; Allen and Kiburz, 2012) to hope (e.g., authenticity; Davis and Hicks, 2013). The dominant trait within this category is core self-evaluations (CSE). Outcomes within this category include employee health (Judge *et al.*, 2012), job satisfaction (Wu and Griffin, 2012), life satisfaction (Jaensch *et al.*, 2015; Rode, 2004), and work-family balance (Allen and Kiburz, 2012).

Discussion

Our review of the research on personality from 2000 – 2020 across 17 top management and psychology journals revealed several key trends that reflect the third phase of personality research. The first trend we observed was that this third phase of personality research is characterized by a breadth of traits covering multiple topic areas. This is a distinction from the past two phases of personality research, which have been dominated by the Big Five and a more cohesive examination of personality. Thus, while this phase provides many opportunities for exploring and understanding the effects of personality through a more tailored approach, there is a challenge presented by the content depth of this phase. Specifically, the challenge the field of personality research now faces is to make sure there is depth by distinguishing among theoretically similar constructs. Before researchers propose a new trait and develop a subsequent scale, have they done an extensive search for similar constructs? While we contend that the development of new constructs ultimately works to better the field, we must ensure that the constructs proposed are empirically distinct and offer incremental validity over theoretically similar constructs. Furthermore, when it comes to examining the effects of these new traits,

scholars should control for the effects of these theoretically similar traits, or a Type I error could occur (Becker, 2005).

A second trend we observed was the contrast between the management and psychology journals regarding the personality variables examined. Given the focus of the journals, it is no surprise that the dependent variables are often different (e.g., life satisfaction in psychology journals vs. job satisfaction in management journals). Yet, we noted that management journals were the most likely to explore the Big 5 global traits (e.g., conscientiousness) and the psychology journals were more likely to explore a greater breadth of traits. This highlights the need for personality researchers of both management and psychology to investigate personality trends across disciplines and to be aware of the current research in both fields. To this end, we hope our review is useful to personality scholars by consolidating and categorizing the traits explored in both disciplines.

A third trend we noticed, which could simply be an echo of what is popular and interesting to practitioners and the public, is a focus on positive strengths. The dark traits, however, were still explored, although to a lesser degree. This leads to an avenue for future research: the interaction of these light and dark traits. For example, how do these traits interact in a team context? Is one category of traits stronger than the other, whereby a member high in honesty-humility could dampen the negative effects of narcissistic teammates? Moreover, while we explore the dark and light traits separately as if on different continuums (such as is done with positive affectivity and negative affectivity), is the reality true that some light traits might empirically be indistinct from low scores on certain dark traits (e.g., high honesty-humility and low narcissism) and that they are opposite poles of the same continuum? Thus, researchers

investigating either light or dark traits might consider investigating these two categories in

tandem.

A fourth trend we observed was the lack of an underlying theory or framework in these

studies. Researchers investigating light side traits utilized the largest number of distinct

theories/frameworks (79 total) to explore these positive traits and their corresponding effects.

Yet, the inclinations category only utilized eight distinct theories. Though beyond the scope of

our review, we did capture some of these theoretical aspects (contact the first author for a table

with these theories/frameworks for the categories).

For practitioners, our review highlights the need to examine personality traits of

employees and managers that exist beyond the Big Five. For instance, organizations use realistic

job previews as a mechanism to screen potential employees, yet, as Baur *et al.* (2014)

demonstrated, different job candidates have different needs, resulting in expectation lowering

procedures for a given job. Identifying a new hire's personality traits, primarily in one of the

categories we identified, can assist organizations in identifying the individual needs to create a

better long-term relationship with a new employee. Similarly, many organizations use specific

personality dimensions—primarily the Big Five (Moy and Lam, 2004)—in their hiring decisions;

however, by focusing solely on the Big Five, it is possible that these organizations are excluding

employees who may excel in other areas based on their personality outside the confines of the

Big Five.

Indeed, the requirements of organizational culture, jobs, and the work environment make

some candidates more suitable than others due to their unique characteristics. The various

personality categories we identified can enable organizations to find candidates that fit well with

the job and the environment. For instance, if a specific job and the work environment is

challenging and maintaining grit and resilience is critical, employers will find that traits in the

fortitude and strength category can be used during the screening process to find candidates that

could be more suitable for the job. Similarly, if the position calls for showing compassion for

others, the traits in the morality category might be used to screen more suitable candidates.

In summation, the classification focus of our systematic review allowed us to identify

common themes for these traits beyond the Big Five that have been examined in the 21st century

and draw conclusions about current trends in this new era of personality. In terms of future

research, we argue that personality scholars should focus less on construct development and

more on testing construct across different contexts. Moreover, as highlighted in our discussion of

each of the categories, there are several fascinating, under-explored traits that could add nuance

to well-understood phenomena. Additionally, we contend that our classification system could

serve as starting point for building a nomological network for many of these constructs. Thus, we

argue that a new era of personality research is also full of opportunity for future research. We

believe our review indicates that we are witnessing a most exciting and potentially powerful era

of personality research.

Limitations

Despite the strengths of our review, there are several limitations. First, due to the breadth

of the field and the number of articles in the review, we focused on only reporting the outcomes

of personality in Table II. Thus, articles were excluded from the table if the personality variable

had no direct or indirect effect on an outcome or if personality was the dependent variable.

Additionally, we do not investigate the mechanisms by which these traits influence outcomes,

nor do we explore the boundary conditions of those relationships. Ultimately, this limits the

scope of our review and the conclusions we can draw. Finally, due to the sheer volume of

personality research, we were only able to classify studies from 17 journals. While we suspect

that we would find a similar pattern of results if we examined studies from the dozens of other

journals that publish personality research, this is only conjecture.

Conclusion

While the past two phases of personality research have been instrumental in the

development and credibility of the field, they have had their drawbacks-namely an overreliance

on the Big Five. We argue – and believe that our comprehensive, systematic review supports –

that the third phase of personality research in the 21st century is characterized by content breadth

(the abundance and proliferation of new personality traits beyond the Big Five). Further, the

movement towards studying personality at different levels of analysis (e.g., team, organization),

has added richness to the field. This third phase of personality research is not without its

limitations, however, as the abundance of traits results in issues of potential problems related to

convergent and discriminant validity amongst the traits within the same categories. Yet, we view

these limitations not as obstacles to be overcome but as challenges to conquer. Indeed, as

constructs evolve over time, as demonstrated by other historical assessments (e.g., Bendickson *et

al.*, 2016; Justin and Joy, 2022; Zoller and Muldoon, 2020), we have shown that personality has

evolved as well and has become even more robust as researchers attempt to explore all of the

ways by which different facets of personality can influence how individuals impact

organizations. Thus, we end our review by figuratively "throwing down the gauntlet" to current

and future personality scholars, calling upon them to take up the mantle of tackling the new

challenges of personality research in the 21st century and hope that this review serves as a useful

steppingstone in that endeavor.

References

*Allen, T.D. (2003), "Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 62, pp. 134-154.

*Allen, T.D. and Kiburz, K.M. (2012), "Trait mindfulness and work-family balance among working parents: The mediating effects of vitality and sleep quality", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 80, pp. 372-379.

*Anderson, C.A., Buckley, K.E. and Carnagey, N.L. (2008), "Creating your own hostile environment: A laboratory examination of trait aggressiveness and the violence escalation cycle", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 462-473.

Antweiler, C. (2009), *Was ist den Menschen gemeinsam? U¨ber Kultur und Kulturen* [What do humans have in common? About culture and cultures] (2nd ed.). Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, Germany.

Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. (1991), "The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 44, pp. 1-26.

Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. and Judge, T.A. (2001), "Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next?", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 9, pp. 9-30.

Baruch, Y., Bell, M.P. and Gray, D. (2005), "Generalist and specialist graduate business degrees: Tangible and intangible value", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 67, pp. 51-68.

*Baum, J.R. and Locke, E.A. (2004), "The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 4, pp. 587-598.

Baur, J.E., Buckley, M.R., Bagdasarov, Z. and Dharmasiri, A.S. (2014), "A historical approach to realistic job previews: An exploration into their origins, evolution, and recommendations for the future", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 200-223.

Becker, T.E. (2005), "Potential problems in the statistical control of variables in organizational research: A qualitative analysis with recommendations", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 274-289.

Bendickson, J., Muldoon, J., Liguori, E.W. and Davis, P.E. (2016), "Agency theory: Background and epistemology", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 437-449.

Berlyne, D.E. (1966), "Curiosity and exploration", *Science*, Vol. 153 No. 3731, pp. 25-33.

*Borges, N.J. and Osmon, W.R. (2001), "Personality and medical specialty choice: Technique orientation versus people orientation", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 22-35.

*Braunstein-Bercovitz, H., Benjamin, B.A., Asor, S. and Lev, M. (2012), "Insecure attachment and career indecision: Mediating effects of anxiety and pessimism", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 81, pp. 236-244.

Buss, A.H. and Plomin, R. (1984), "Theory and measurement of EAS", Buss, A.H. and Plomin, R. (Eds.), *Temperament: Early developing personality traits*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 98-130.

*Cable, D.M. and Kay, V.S. (2012), "Striving for self-verification during organizational entry", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 360-380.

*Caughlin, J.P., Huston, T.L. and Houts, R.M. (2000), "How does personality matter in marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity, and marital satisfaction", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 326-336.

*Chan, D. (2006), "Interactive effects of situational judgment effectiveness and proactive personality on work perceptions and work outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91 No. 2, pp. 475-481.

*Chen, G., Farh, J.L., Campbell-Bush, E.M., Wu, Z. and Wu, X. (2013), "Teams as innovative systems: Multilevel motivational antecedents of innovation in R&D teams", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 98 No. 6, pp. 1018-1027.

*Chen, J., Tang, T.L.P. and Tang, N. (2014), "Temptation, monetary intelligence (love of money), and environmental context on unethical intentions and cheating", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 123, pp. 197-219.

Chen, S.X., Bond, M.H., Chan, B., Tang, D. and Buchtel, E.E. (2009), "Behavioral manifestations of modesty", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 603-626.

*Converse, P.D., Pathak, J., DePaul-Haddock, A.M., Gotlib, T. and Merbedone, M. (2012), "Controlling your environment and yourself: Implications for career success", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 80, pp. 148-159.

*Davis, W.E. and Hicks, J.A. (2013), "Maintaining hope at the 11th hour: Authenticity buffers the effect of limited time perspective on hope", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 39 No. 12, pp. 1634-1646.

*Day, L.C., Muise, A. and Impett, E.A. (2017), "Is comparison the thief of joy? Sexual narcissism and social comparisons in the domain of sexuality", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 233-244.

*de Vries, R.E. (2012), "Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self-other agreement problem", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 809-821.

*Detert, J.R., Treviño, L.K. and Sweitzer, V.L. (2008), "Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93 No. 2, pp. 374-391.

Duckworth, A.L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M.D. and Kelly, D.R. (2007), "Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 92 No. 6, pp. 1087-1101.

*Fuller Jr., J.B., Marler, L.E. and Hester, K. (2012), "Bridge building within the province of proactivity", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 33, pp. 1053-1070.

Funder, D.C. (2001), "Personality", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 197-221.

*Gerstner, W.C., König, A., Enders, A. and Hambrick, D.C. (2013), "CEO narcissism, audience engagement, and organizational adoption of technological discontinuities", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 58 No. 2, pp. 257-291.

*Gilmore, P.L., Hu, X., Wei, F., Tetrick, L.E. and Zaccaro, S.J. (2013), "Positive affectivity neutralizes transformational leadership's influence on creative performance and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 34, pp. 1061-1075.

*Goldman, B.M. (2003), "The application of referent cognitions theory to legal-claiming by terminated workers: The role of organizational justice and anger", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 705-728.

*Gong, Y., Cheung, S.Y., Wang, M. and Huang, J.C. (2012), "Unfolding the proactive process for creativity: Integration of the employee proactivity, information exchange, and psychological safety perspectives", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 1611-1633.

Gong, Y., Zhou, J. and Chang, S. (2013), "Core knowledge employee creativity and firm performance: The moderating role of riskiness orientation, firm size, and realized absorptive capacity," *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 443-482.

*Greenbaum, R.L., Hill, A., Mawritz, M.B. and Quade, M.J. (2017), "Employee Machiavellianism to unethical behavior: The role of abusive supervision as a trait activator," *Journal of Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 585-609.

Guion, R.M. and Gottier, R.F. (1965), "Validity of personality measures in personnel selection", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 135-164.

Guion, R.M. (1998), *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel selection*. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

*Harrison, S.H., Sluss, D.M. and Ashforth, B.E. (2011), "Curiosity adapted the cat: The role of trait curiosity in newcomer adaptation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 96, pp. 211-220.

*Herrman, A., Hirschi, A. and Baruch, Y. (2015), "The protean career orientation as predictor of career outcomes: Evaluation of incremental validity and mediation effects", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 88, pp. 205-214.

*Hilbig, B.E., Glöckner, A. and Zettler, I. (2014), "Personality and prosocial behavior: Linking basic traits and social value orientations", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 107 No. 3, pp. 529-539.

*Hirschfeld, R.R., Thomas, C.H. and Bernerth, J.B. (2011), "Consequences of autonomous and team-oriented forms of dispositional proactivity for demonstrating advancement potential. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 237-247.

*Hirschi, A., Abessolo, M. and Froidevaux, A. (2015), "Hope as a resource for career exploration: Examining incremental and cross-lagged effects", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 86, pp. 38-47.

*Hough, J.R. and Ogilvie, D. (2005), "An empirical test of cognitive style and strategic decision outcomes", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 417-448.

*Jackson, C.L., Colquitt, J.A., Wesson, M.J. and Zapata-Phelan, C.P. (2006), "Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91 No. 4, pp. 884-899.

*Jaensch, V.K., Hirschi, A. and Freund, P.A. (2015), "Persistent career indecision over time: Links with personality, barriers, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 91, pp. 122-133.

*Jawahar, I.M. (2001), "Attitudes, self-monitoring, and appraisal behaviors", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 5, pp. 875-883.

*Jiang, Z. (2017), "Proactive personality and career adaptability: The role of thriving at work", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 98, pp. 85-97.

*Jokela, M., Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M. and Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (2009), "Personality and having children: A two-way relationship", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 96, pp. 218-230.

*Judge, T.A. and Ilies, R. (2004), "Affect and job satisfaction: A study of their relationship at work and at home", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 4, pp. 661-673.

*Judge, T.A., Ilies, R. and Zhang, Z. (2012), "Genetic influences on core self-evaluations, job satisfaction, and work stress: A behavioral genetic mediated model", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 117, pp. 208-220.

Justin, M.A.E. and Joy, M.M. (2022), "Managing the most important asset: A twenty year review on the performance management literature", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 428-451.

*Kumar, K.K. and Mishra, S.K. (2017), "Subordinate-superior upward communication: Power, politics, and political skill", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 56 No. 6, pp. 1015-1037.

Lee, K. and Ashton, M.C. (2004), "Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 329-358.

*Lilienfeld, S.O., Waldman, I.D., Landfield, K., Watts, A.L., Rubenzer, S. and Faschingbauer, T.R. (2012), "Fearless dominance and the U.S. presidency: Implications of psychopathic personality traits for successful and unsuccessful political leadership", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 103 No. 3, pp. 489-505.

*Lindsay, J.J. and Anderson, C.A. (2000), "From antecedent conditions to violent actions: A general affective aggression model", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 533-547.

*Long, C.R., Seburn, M., Averill, J.R. and More, T.A. (2003), "Solitude experiences: Varieties, settings, and individual differences", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 578-583.

*MacNab, B.R. and Worthley, R. (2008), "Self-efficacy as an intrapersonal predictor for internal whistleblowing: A US and Canada examination", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 79, pp. 407-421.

*Major, J.T., Johnson, W. and Deary, I.J. (2014), "Linear and nonlinear associations between general intelligence and personality in Project TALENT", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 106 No. 4, pp. 638-654.

McCrae, R.R. and John, O.P. (1992), "An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 60, pp. 175-215.

McCroskey, J.C. and Richmond, V.P. (1987), "Willingness to communicate", McCroskey, J.C. and Daly, J.A. (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 129-155.

*Mehra, A., Kilduff, M. and Brass, D.J. (2001), "The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 46, pp. 121-146.

Moy, J.W. and Lam, K.F. (2004), "Selection criteria and the impact of personality on getting hired", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 521-535.

*Mussel, P. (2013), "Introducing the construct curiosity for predicting job performance", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 34, pp. 453-472.

*Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B. and Sendjaya, S. (2017), "How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 145, pp. 49-62.

*Peterson, C., Park, N., Hall, N. and Seligman, M.E.P. (2009), "Zest and work", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 30, pp. 161-172.

*Pillemer, J., Graham, E.R. and Burke, D.M. (2014), "The face says it all: CEOs, gender, and predicting corporate performance", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25, pp. 855-864.

Pollach, I. (2022), "The diffusion of management fads: A popularization perspective", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 284-302.

*Porter, C.O.L.H., Franklin, D.A., Swider, B.W. and Yu, R.C.F. (2016), "An exploration of the interactive effects of leader trait goal orientation and goal content in teams", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 27, pp. 34-50.

*Reina, C.R., Zhang, Z. and Peterson, S.J. (2014), "CEO grandiose narcissism and firm performance: The role of organizational identification", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25, pp. 958-971.

*Rhoades, J.A., Arnold, J. and Jay, C. (2001), "The role of affective traits and affective states in disputants' motivation and behavior during episodes of organizational conflict", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22, pp. 329-345.

*Rode, J.C. (2004), "Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model", *Human Relations*, Vol. 57 No. 9, pp. 1205-1230.

*Rubin, R.S., Munz, D.C. and Bommer, W.H. (2005), "Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 845-858.

*Sasovova, Z., Mehra, A., Borgatti, S.P. and Schippers, M.C. (2010), "Network churn: The effects of self-monitoring personality on brokerage dynamics", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 55 No. 4, pp. 639-670.

Sauley, K.S. and Bedeian, A.G. (2000), "Equity sensitivity: Construction of a measure and examination of its psychometric properties", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 885-910.

Schneider, B. and Bartram, D. (2017), "Aggregate personality and organizational competitive advantage", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 90 No. 4, pp. 461-480.

*Scott, B.A. and Judge, T.A. (2009), "The popularity contest at work: Who wins, why, and what do they receive?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94, pp. 20-33.

*Shalley, C.E., Gilson, L.L. and Blum, T.C. (2009), "Interactive effects of growth need strength, work context, and job complexity on self-reported creative performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 489-505.

*Sheldon, K.M., Jose, P.E., Kashdan, T.B. and Jarden, A. (2015), "Personality, effective goal-striving, and enhanced well-being: Comparing 10 candidate personality strengths", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 575-585.

*Shiner, R.L., Masten, A.S. and Tellegen, A. (2002), "A developmental perspective on personality in emerging adulthood: Childhood antecedents and concurrent adaptation", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 5, pp. 1165-1177.

*Slaughter, J.E., Zickar, M.J., Highhouse, S. and Mohr, D.C. (2004), "Personality trait inferences about organizations: Development of a measure and assessment of construct validity", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, pp. 85-103.

Spain, S.M., Harms, P. and LeBreton, J.M. (2014), "The dark side of personality at work", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 35, pp. 41-60.

*Stajkovic, A.D., Lee, D., Greenwald, J.M. and Raffiee, J. (2015), "The role of trait core confidence higher-order construct in self-regulation on performance and attitudes: Evidence from four studies", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 128, pp. 29-48.

*Sturmer, S., Benbow, A.E.F., Siem, B., Barth, M., Bodansky, A.N. and Lotz-Schmitt, K. (2013), "Psychological foundations of xenophilia: The role of major personality traits in predicting favorable attitudes toward cross-cultural contact and exploration", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 105 No. 5, pp. 832-851.

Swann, W.B. (1987), "Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 53 No. 6, pp. 1038-1051.

*Swann, W.B. and Rentfrow, P.J. (2001), "Blirtatiousness: Cognitive, behavioral, and psychological consequences of rapid responding", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 1160-1175.

Tellegen, A. (1982), *Brief manual of the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N. and Rothstein, M. (1991), "Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 703-742.

*Tews, M.J., Michel, J.W. and Noe, R.A. (2011), "Beyond objectivity: The performance impact of the perceived ability to learn and solve problems", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 79, pp. 484-495.

*Tharenou, P. (2001), "Going up? Do traits and informal social processes predict advancing in management?", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 1005-1017.

*van Hooft, E.A.J., Born, M.P., Taris, T.W., van der Flier, H. and Blonk, R.W.B. (2005), "Bridging the gap between intentions and behavior: Implementation intentions, action control, and procrastination", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 66, pp. 238-256.

Wood, T., Souza, R. and Caldas, M.P. (2022), "The relevance of management research debate: A historical view, 1876-2018", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 409-427.

*Wu, C.H. and Griffin, M.A. (2012), "Longitudinal relationships between core self-evaluations and job satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 97 No. 2, pp. 331-342.

*Zhang, H., Ou, A.Y., Tsui, A. and Wang, H. (2017), "CEO humility, narcissism and firm innovation: A paradox perspective on CEO traits", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 5, pp. 585-604.

Zoller, Y.J. and Muldoon, J. (2020), "Journey of a concept: Span of control – the rise, the decline, and what is next?", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 515-533.

* denotes article was included as part of the review

Table I

Journal List for Systematic Review

Journal	Number of Articles (Total)	Number of Relevant Articles (Coded)
Academy of Management Journal	41	22
Administrative Science Quarterly	8	7
Human Relations	25	8
Human Resource Management	15	4
Journal of Applied Psychology	310	97
Journal of Business Ethics	130	45
Journal of Management	68	18
Journal of Management Studies	8	3
Journal of Organizational Behavior	89	28
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	315	46
Journal of Vocational Behavior	193	56
Leadership Quarterly	96	13
Organization Science	16	4
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	57	14
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin	322	57
Personnel Psychology	106	18
Psychological Bulletin	102	0
	N = 1,901	*N = 440*

Table II

Personality Constructs for the New Millennium

Personality Category	Category Definition	Included Traits	Exemplar Construct
Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits	Deal with an individual's career and work life, including performance-related traits and leader-specific traits	Abstractedness; Achievement Orientation; Ambition; Approach Orientation / Avoidance Orientation; Cognitive Style / Ability; Career Indecisiveness; Career Identity Salience; Charismatic Leadership; Competence; Creativity; Duty Orientation; (Leader) Goal Orientation (Learning and Performance); Growth Need Strength; Innovativeness; Leader Affective Presence; Leader Humility; Manager Aspirations; Mastery Orientation; Occupational Self-Efficacy; Organizational Personality (Boy Scout, Innovativeness. Dominance, Thrift, Style); PALS; Passion for work; Protean Career Orientation; Reasoning; Service Orientation; Time Management; Trait Competitiveness; Trait Prevention Focus; Trait Promotion Focus; Vocational Personality	*Protean Career Orientation* - a relatively stable career preference that values self-directedness and defines career success according to the person's personal values (Baruch et al., 2005)
Dark Side Traits	Generally viewed as negative or destructive	Aggression; Contempt; Hedonism; Hostility; Impulsivity; Machiavellianism; Moral Disengagement Propensity; Narcissism (CEO, Grandiose, Leader, Sexual); Psychopathy; Sadism; Temptation; Thrill-seeking	*Machiavellianism* - one's propensity to distrust others, engage in amoral manipulation, seek control over others, and seek status for oneself (Dahling et al., 2009)
Emotionality and Trait Emotions	Deal with emotional expression or emotions operationalized as traits	Anger; Anxiety; Calmness; Depression; Emotional Intelligence; Emotionality (Positive/Negative); Negative and Positive Affectivity; Negative Mood; Nostalgia	*(Trait) Anger or Anger Proneness* - an individual difference in the frequency that state anger is experienced over time (Spielberger et al., 1999)

Journal of Management History

Personality Category	Category Definition	Included Traits	Exemplar Construct
Fortitude and Strength Traits	Represent an individual's mental strength and tendency to persevere in difficult situations	Assertiveness; Core Confidence; Emotional Coping; Grit; Self-Control; Self-Reliance; Tenacity; Tough-mindedness; Vigilance; Vigor	*Grit* - perseverance and passion for long-term goals (Duckworth et al, 2007)
Light Side Traits	Generally viewed as positive or beneficial	Adaptability; Communal/Communion (vs. Agentic/Agency); Cooperation; Curiosity / Epistemic Curiosity; Helping; Hope; Intrinsic Motivation; Proactive Personality; Self-Confidence; Self-Efficacy; Self-Esteem; Warmth	*Proactive Personality* - a dispositional characteristic defined as a behavioral tendency toward taking personal initiative in creating a favorable environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993)
Morality Traits	Deal with an individual's treatment of others and their moral character	Compassion; Empathy; Forgiveness; Gratitude; Harmony; Honesty-Humility (HEXACO); Integrity; Modesty; Moral Identity; Spirituality; Virtue	*Empathy* - the tendency to feel warmth, compassion, and concern for others (Davis, 1983)
Outlook Traits	Reflect how an individual views or approaches the world	Cynicism; Entitlement; Future Self-Continuity; Equity-Sensitivity; Guilt Proneness; Happiness; Internal Locus of Control; Optimism; Personal Fear of Invalidity; Pessimism; Propensity to Trust; Psychological Empowerment; Rigidity; Risk-taking; Rule-consciousness; Savoring; Social Dominance Orientation; Traditionalism; Unconventionality; Veraciousness; Xenophilia; Zest	*Zest* - a positive trait reflecting a person's approach to life with anticipation, energy, and excitement (Peterson et al., 2009)

Personality Category	Category Definition	Included Traits	Exemplar Construct
Inclinations	Reflect an individual's predispositions towards aspects of their life	Activity; Dispositional Resistance to Change; Flexibility; Indecisiveness; Independence; Preference for Solitude; Procrastination; Self-Verification Striving; Sensation Seeking; Straightforwardness; Tidiness; Willingness to Communicate	*Self-Verification Striving* - the tendency for individuals to promote the survival of their self-conceptions, irrespective of whether they are good or bad (Swann, 1987)
Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits	Reflect how an individual acts around others and in social situations	Blirtatiousness; Conformance; Core Group Expression; Dysphoric Personality; Emotional Labor Variability; Face; Perceived Positivity Resonance; Prosocial Personality; Psychological Collectivism; Self-Disclosure; Self-Monitoring; Shyness; Sociability; Social Boldness; Social Closeness; Social Potency; Social Presence; Social Sensitivity; Sociotropy; Team-oriented Proactivity	*Sociability* - a tendency for an individual to enjoy the company of others more than a solitary lifestyle (Buss & Plomin, 1984)
Well-Being and Self-View Traits	Reflect how an individual views their inner world and their overall wellbeing	Authenticity; Core-Self Evaluation; Femininity / Masculinity; Mindfulness; Privateness; Psychological Gender; Self-Acceptance; Self-Compassion; Self-Concept Clarity; Self-Critical Perfectionism; Stress Reactivity; Well-Being	*Authenticity* - the free and unhindered operation of one's true or core self in daily life (Kernis & Goldman, 2006)

Note: Full citations in this table are available from the authors.

Table III

Personality Category Outcomes

Personality Category	Category Linked Outcomes	Selected Citations
Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits	Burnout; Career Adaptability; Career Satisfaction; CSEs; Competitive Climate; Creative Performance; Creative Process Engagement; Enterprising Interest; Group Influence; Idealism; Income; Innovation Implementation; Job Performance; Learning performance; LMX; Management Advancement; Medical Specialty; Occupational Self-Efficacy; OCBs; Organizational Attractiveness; Organizational / Firm Performance; Perceived Career Barriers; Perception of Novelty; Personality-Work Congruence; Proactive Career Behaviors; Team Information Sharing; Team Innovation; Team Learning; Team Task Commitment; Team Task Performance; Training Performance; Self-Efficacy; Skill Attainment; Solitude; Strategic Decision Outcomes; Unemployment Outcomes (Mental Health, Motivational Control, Self-Defeating Cognition, Time Spent on Job Search); Venture Growth; Victimization; Voice	Anderson & Kilduff (2009); Baum & Locke (2004); Bettencourt et al. (2001); Bierly et al. (2009); Borges & Osmon (2001); Chen et al. (2000); Chiu et al. (2016); Donohue (2006); Dul et al. (2011); Fletcher et al. (2008); Hough & Ogilvie (2005); Jaensch et al. (2015); Kim & Glomb (2010); Kozlowski et al. (2001); Long et al. (2003); Madrid et al. (2016); McCarthy et al. (2013); Nichols & Cottrell (2014); Porter et al. (2016); Pryor et al. (2017); Schröder & Schmitt-Rodermund (2006); Shalley et al. (2009); Sherman et al. (2015); Slaughter et al. (2004); Somech & Drach-Zahavy (2013); Taber et al. (2011); Tangirala et al. (2013); Tews et al. (2011); Tharenou (2001); To et al. (2015); Tolentino et al. (2014); Wanberg et al. (2012); Watson et al. (2013); Zhou et al (2017)

Personality Category	Category Linked Outcomes	Selected Citations
Dark Side Traits	Abusive Supervision; Advice Taking; Anti-intellectualism; Approach / Avoidance Motivation; Attitudes Towards Cheating; Big Five Similarity; Bullying Others; Career Engagement; Careerism; CEO (Executive) Compensation; Contextual Performance; CWBs; Deviant Behavior; Dyad Aggression Level; Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Ethical Orientation; Follower Behaviors; Frequency of Transgressions; Group Effectiveness; Helping Behavior; Innovative Culture / Performance; Job Satisfaction; Leader Behaviors; Leadership Style Preference; Marriage Propensity; Mental Health; Narcissism; OCBs; Organizational / Firm Performance; Presidential Performance; Prioritization of Needs (Own vs. Group); Problem Behaviors; Prosocial Behavior; Relationship Commitment; Role Satisfaction; Self-Ratings of Leadership; Sexual Comparison / Satisfaction; Social Activity; Social Desirability Response Bias; State Hostility; Status; Successful Interpersonal Behavior; Task Performance; (Discontinuous) Technology Adoption; Undergraduate Major Choice; Unemployment (risk, duration); Unethical Behaviors / Decision-Making / Intentions; Victimization; Work-Family Conflict; Workplace Deviance	Anderson et al. (2008); Aquino & Bradfield (2000); Baysinger et al. (2014); Benson et al. (2016); Bing et al. (2007); Bloodgood et al. (2010); Brown et al. (2009); Buffardi & Campbell (2008); Campbell & Foster (2002); Carlson & DesJardins (2015); Chen et al. (2014); Chiaburu et al. (2013); Cooper et al. (2003); Day et al. (2017); Dubbelt et al. (2015); Dahling et al. (2009); Foster & Trimm (2008); Gerstner et al. (2013); Hakulinen et al. (2013); Johnson et al. (2004); Judge et al. (2006); Kausel et al. (2015); Larson et al. (2010); Liang et al. (2016); Lilienfeld et al. (2012); Lindsay & Anderson (2000); Liu et al. (2017); Maaß et al. (2016); Martin et al. (2016); McCullough et al. (2003); Nilforooshan & Salimi (2016); O'Reilly et al. (2014); Pilch & Turska (2015); Resick et al. (2009); Wales et al. (2013); Stevens et al. (2012), Zhang et al. (2017)
Emotionality and Trait Emotions	Aggression Towards Targets; Career Exploration / Indecision; Competitive Behavior; Concern for Self; Creative Process Engagement; CWBs; Discrimination Legal Claims; Feelings of Powerlessness; Hostile Priming Effect; Job Performance; Leader Development; Life Satisfaction; Maladaptation; Marital Dissatisfaction; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Petty Tyranny; Probability of Having Children; Relationship Happiness / Success / Quality; Transformational Leadership;	Braunstein-Bercovitz et al. (2012); Caughlin et al. (2000); Donnellan et al. (2005); Goldman (2003); Farh et al. (2012); Inness et al. (2008); Jokela et al. (2009); Kant et al. (2013); Law et al. (2004); Popper & Amit (2009); Rhoades et al. (2001); Robins et al. (2000); Rubin et al. (2005); Safer et al. (2002); Shiner et al. (2002); To et al. (2015); Wilkowski & Robinson (2007); Vignoli (2015)

Personality Category	Category Linked Outcomes	Selected Citations
Fortitude and Strength Traits	Abusive Supervision; Academic Achievement; Career Success; Cynicism; Decision Effectiveness; Defensive Processing; Educational Attainment; Employee Exit; Goal Attainment; GPA; Life Satisfaction; Medical Specialty; Occupational Opportunity for Achievement; Organizational Attractiveness; Performance; Problem Behaviors; Team Performance; Team Satisfaction; Workplace Deviance	Borges & Osmon (2001); Converse et al. (2012); Cooper et al. (2003); Guarana & Hernandez (2016); Hartung et al. (2005); Kausel & Slaughter (2011); Naus et al. (2007); Pearsall & Ellis (2006); Restubog et al. (2015); Rimfeld et al. (2016); Ruttan & Nordgren (2016); Sheldon et al. (2015); Stajkovic et al. (2015); Taber et al (2011); Yam et al. (2016)
Light Side Traits	Affective Organizational Commitment; Behavioral Schemas; Boundaryless Career Mindset; Career Adaptability / Concern / Confidence / Control / Curiosity / Engagement / Exploration / Indecisiveness / Initiative / Monitoring / Satisfaction / Success; Charismatic Leadership; Company Profits / Rank; Creative Performance; Creativity; CWBs; Educational Attainment; Entrepreneurial Alertness; Feedback Acceptance; Financial Accomplishments; Future Work Self; Goal Attainment / Self-Concordance; Information Seeking Behaviors; Innovative Behavior / Performance; Job Control; Job Demands; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Job Search Outcomes; Leadership Style Preference; Learning Performance; Life Satisfaction; Loneliness; Mate Preferences; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Mental Health; Mentoring; Negative Affect; OCBs; Occupational Attainment; Organizational Constraints; Performance Evaluations; Political Knowledge; Positive Affect; Positive Framing; Proactive Work Behavior; Procedural Justice; Productivity Performance; Psychological Need Satisfaction; Resource Power; Safety Performance; Self-Concept Clarity; Social Adjustment; Social Integration; Social Power; Supervisor Support; Task Performance; Team Performance; Training Behavioral Intentions / Motivation; Transactional Contracts; Trust; Whistleblowing	Bakker et al. (2012); Bertolino et al. (2011); Brown et al. (2006); Brown et al. (2009); Byrne et al. (2008); Cai et al.(2015); Chan (2006); Chen et al. (2000); Chen et al. (2013); Converse et al. (2012); Crant & Bateman (2000); Duffy & Lent (2009); Ehrhart & Klein (2001); Erdogan & Bauer (2005); Fisher et al. (2012); Gebauer et al. (2012); Gong et al. (2012); Greguras & Diefendorff (2010); Harrison & Dossinger (2017); Harrison et al. (2011); Hirschi et al. (2015); Jaensch et al. (2015); Jiang (2017); Kammrath (2011); Lent et al. (2012); Li et al. (2010); Li et al. (2014); Liang & Gong (2013); Long et al. (2003); MacNab & Worthley (2008); Miceli et al. (2012); Mussel (2013); Ng & Feldman (2013); Nilforooshan & Salimi (2016); Parker et al. (2006); Pillemer et al. (2014); Raja et al. (2004); Roberts et al., (2003); Saragovi et al. (2002); Seibert et al. (2001); Shalley et al. (2009); Stinson et al. (2008); Sun & van Emmerik (2015); Taber et al. (2011); Tews et al. (2011); Thompson (2005); Tolentino et al. (2014); Uy et al. (2015); Van der Horst et al. (2017); Wallace et al. (2009); Wang et al. (2017); Wood & Harms (2017); Zhang et al. (2015)

Personality Category	Category Linked Outcomes	Selected Citations
Morality Traits	Abusive Supervision; CWBs; Emotional Social Support; Ethical Behaviors / Choices; Job Burnout; Job Pursuit Behaviors; Interpersonal Contextual Behaviors; Moral Disengagement; OCBs; Personal Improvement; Prosocial Behaviors; Revenge; Servant-Oriented OCBs; Unethical Bargaining / Decision-Making; Wellbeing	Agnihorti et al. (2012); Bettencourt et al. (2001); Breevaart & de Vries (2017); Cohen (2010); Connelly et al. (2004); Detert et al. (2008); Hilbig & Blöckner (2014); Joireman et al. (2006); Kashdan & Nezlek (2012); Kwong and Cheung (2003); Marcus et al. (2007); Ogunfowora (2014); Wang et al. (2018); Zelars & Perrewe (2001); Zhang & Chen (2016)
Outlook Traits	Attentional Bias; Career Indecision; Compassion; Creativity; Ethical Behavior; Enterprising Interest; Group / Team Performance; Leader Emergence; Leadership Style Preference; Life Satisfaction; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Moral Disengagement; Moral Identity; Organizational Attractiveness; Personal Contextual Behaviors; Proactive Work Behavior; Time to Complete Dull Task; Transactional Contracts; Unethical Behavior; Venture Growth; View of Work as a Calling	Agnihorti et al. (2012); Borges & Osman (2001); Braunstein-Bercovitz et al. (2012); Detert et al. (2008); Ehrhart & Klein (2001); Ferguson & Peterson (2015); Fisher et al. (2012); Gong et al. (2012); Hershfield et al. (2012); Johnson et al. (2004); Kausel & Slaughter (2011); Kwong & Cheung (2003); Lee & Tsang (2001); Marinova et al. (2013); Martin et al. (2015); O'Brien et al. (2011); Parker et al. (2006); Peterson et al. (2009); Raja et al. (2004); Safer et al. (2002); Schröder & Schmitt-Rodermund (2006); Segerstrom (2001); Sosik et al. (2014); Taber et al. (2011)
Inclinations	Career Adaptivity / Engagement / Success; Concession Making; Employee Compliance / Championing; Inner-directed Solitude; Intelligence; Job Satisfaction; Job Search Behavior; Medical Specialty; Newcomer Work Performance; Organizational Commitment; Probability of Having Children	Byrne et al. (2008); Cable & Kay (2012); DeRue et al. (2009); Fugate & Soenen (2018); Hartung et al. (2005); Jokela et al. (2009); Long et al. (2003); Major et al. (2014); Nilforooshan & Salimi (2016)

Personality Category	Category Linked Outcomes	Selected Citations
Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits	Advancement Potential; Creation of New Friends / Friend Groups; Ethical Behaviors; Group Member Performance (Task, OCB, CWB, Withdrawal); Image Outcomes; Intelligence; Intention to Report Fraudulent Behaviors; Interpersonal Contextual Behaviors; Interpersonal Stress; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; Position or Role Occupancy; Probability of Having Children; Propensity to Mentor Others; Social Network Position; Trust; Work Withdrawal	Allen (2003); Hirschfeld et al. (2011); Jackson et al. (2006); Jokela et al. (2009); Johnson et al. (2004); Kwong & Cheung (2003); Major et al. (2014); Mehra et al. (2001); Oh & Kilduff (2008); Ross & Robertson (2003); Sasovaova et al. (2010); Scott et al. (2012); Shih (2006); Taber et al. (2011); Tasselli & Kilduff (2017); Turnley & Bolino (2001); Uddin & Gillett (2002)
Well-Being and Self-View Traits	CWBs; Employee Health; Ethical Perceptions; Goal Orientation; Goal Commitment; Goal-Setting Behavior; Hope; Income; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Life Satisfaction; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; OCBs; Organizational Commitment; Perceptions of Support; Popularity; Productivity; Task Complexity / Motivation / Performance / Satisfaction; Turnover Intentions; Voice Behavior; Work-Family Balance; Work Stress; Work Success	Allen & Kiburz (2012); Aryee et al. (2017); Bono & Colbert (2005); Bowling et al. (2010); Davis & Hicks (2013); Erez & Judge (2001); Ferris et al. (2011); Grant & Wrzesniewski (2010); Johnson et al. (2004); Judge & Hurst (2008); Judge et al. (2000); Judge et al. (2003); Judge et al. (2009); Judge et al. (2012); Kacmar et al. (2009); Luria & Torjman (2009); McCabe et al. (2006); Piccolo et al. (2005); Scott & Judge (2009); Srivastava et al. (2010); Taber et al. (2011); Westring & Ryan (2010); Wu & Griffin (2012); Zhang & Chen (2016)

Note: Full citations are available from the authors.