February 2012

A Portrait of HR: The Personality Traits of Human Resources Professionals

E. Anne Christo-Baker
Purdue University North Central

Cristina de-Mello-e-Souza Wildermuth
Drake University

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/jnams

JOURNAL OF THE NORTH AMERICAN MANAGEMENT SOCIETY

NAMS
NORTH AMERICAN MANAGEMENT SOCIETY

A Portrait of HR: The Personality Traits of
Human Resources Professionals

E. Anne Christo-Baker, Purdue University North Central
Cristina de-Mello-e-Souza Wildermuth, Drake University

*** *The names of the authors are listed alphabetically. All authors contributed equally to the article.*

Human capital is the backbone of organizations. Indeed, it has been suggested that the Human Resource (HR) function – through its influence on human capital – directly and indirectly impacts organizational outcomes such as profitability, productivity, and competitive advantage (Roehling et al., 2005). In particular, HR can contribute to the organization's strategy (Ulrich & Brockbank, 2005), potentially affecting 20% of business results (Ulrich, Brockbank, Johnson, Sandholtz & Younger, 2008). Further, HR plays a pivotal role in shaping organizational culture (Ulrich et al., 2008; SHRM, 2011). Thus, HR professionals can influence the organizational experience of most if not all employees (Scroggins, 2008).

A search of academic databases (Academic Search Premier, OmniFile Full text – Wilson, EBSCO, JSTOR Arts & Sciences, and Google Scholar) was conducted using various combinations of search strings including the words human, resource(s) profession/al. This search yielded numerous results (874,000). Closer scrutiny, however, revealed that over 95% of these results were about human resource issues as opposed to human resource practitioners. This could indicate a dearth of research on the characteristics and experiences of human resource professionals and signal a need for further research on the profession.

This study seeks to expand the body of research on personality and leadership within the context of HR by examining the traits of human resource professionals. Specifically, this study seeks to explore differences in personality between HR professionals and non-HR executives and among three levels of HR service (vice presidents/directors, managers, and generalists). The study's implications for practice may include (a) helping inform those who hire, support, and lead HR professionals make more informed decisions and (b) contributing to the understanding of the impact of personality on job performance.

This study's results could enhance the understanding of the impact of personality on various leadership levels. Indeed, Charan, Drotter and Noel (2001) suggested that leaders face, as they progress through a large organization, "six career passages" involving the management of self, others, other managers, functions, businesses, groups, and enterprises. Each passage encompasses the application of different skills and work values (Charan et al., 2001) and might, therefore, be best supported by different personality traits.

The following sections examine the challenges faced by and required of HR professionals in the 21st century, review existing findings on leadership and personality, summarize and discuss the findings, and offer topics for further research.

THE HR ROLE: NEW CHALLENGES AND COMPETENCIES

HR professionals handle a multiplicity of functions within organizations and face accompanying challenges: They have responsibility for staffing, human resource development, compensation, safety, health, and employee relations. Interacting with individuals at all levels of the organization, HR

professionals often act as intermediaries communicating to employees on behalf of management and acting as employee advocates or representatives to management (SHRM, 2008).

In the past, HR professionals were seen as administrative experts whose role was largely transactional (Ulrich et al., 2008). Critics thus argued that HR lacked credibility with senior organizational leaders and did not participate in the forging of business strategy (Collings & Wood, 2009). Accordingly, various authors have proposed the need for HR to play a more strategic leadership role and to join in organizational strategic planning and decision-making (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart & Wright, 2010; Ulrich et al., 2008; York, 2010). For instance, Roehling et al. (2005) suggested that the focus of HR be switched "from the management o f human resources to the development and maintenance of organizational effectiveness" (p. 207). Pilenzo (2009) went a step further, arguing that the HR function must "change its DNA" (p. 63) and embrace a "new paradigm" (p. 74). This "new paradigm" involves stronger metrics, a stronger consulting role, a broadening of the traditional HR career path, and the "leveraging (of) HR as an organizational strategy" (p. 69).

Arguably, the *competencies* required for HR professionals within this "new paradigm" could also be evolving. Neither the academic literature nor practitioner publications have identified a *universal* set of competencies connected to HR effectiveness or success. Instead, the search for the HR competencies related to HR success appears to be a moving target. McEvoy et al. (2005) suggested that graduate HR programs focus on a progressive competency model involving four "stages": acquiring, applying, mastering, and influencing. Competency areas recommended by McEvoy et al. (2005) included *general business*, *organizational change*, *technical competence*, and *professional credibility*.

The most frequently cited HR competency study, however, was led by Dave Ulrich (Ulrich, Brockbank, Johnson, & Younger, 2007) and resulted from five different data collection processes around the world. The Ulrich Competency Model includes six competency areas (Ulrich et al., 2007, p. 6-8):

- "*Credible activists*" command respect and act on behalf of their positions and beliefs.

- "*Culture and change stewards*" honor the organization's culture but are also able to orchestrate culture change.

- "*Talent managers and organizational designers*" capably manage organizational talent and align it to effective organizational processes and policies.

- "*Strategy architects*" strongly contribute to the overall business strategy.

- "*Operational executors*" skillfully complete the necessary technical and operational tasks normally assigned to human resources professionals such as policy drafting and implementation, recruitment, hiring, training, etc.

- "*Business allies*" have a good understanding of the business goals and needs and partner with other business units to maximize organizational results.

Recently, SHRM (2011) issued a comprehensive international report on the most important competencies for HR *senior leaders*. SHRM's study suggested that two competencies – *strategic thinking* and *effective communications* – are particularly valuable for senior leaders in all regions polled (United States, Canada, India, Middle East, and North Africa). Other relevant senior leader competencies included *global and cross-cultural intelligence*, *integrity*, *critical / analytical thinking*, *coaching*, and *leading change*. Table 1 summarizes the top HR competencies proposed by McEvoy et al. (2005), Ulrich et al. (2007), and SHRM (2011).

HR professionals, however, are unlikely to develop competencies "in a vacuum." A competency, after all, involves "what a person is, knows, and does that is causally related to superior performance (McEvoy et al., 2005, p. 385). Reasonably, what the person "is" involves a framework of traits and tendencies. Accordingly, Howard and Howard's (2001a) *Workplace Big Five Profile* connects competencies to all "big five" traits. Table 1 suggests possible connections between the Big Five traits and key HR competencies. Further, personality may impact the leadership *passages* (Charan et al., 2001) experienced by HR professionals. Possible connections between personality and leadership are examined next.

LEADERSHIP, PERSONALITY, AND THE FIVE FACTOR MODEL

Early 20th century leadership theories focused on differentiating leaders and non-leaders. Van Seters and Field (1990) defined this period as the "Personality Era" dividing the theories from that time into two groups: "Great Man" and "Trait" theories. "Great Man" theories focused on characteristics of renowned leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi and Abraham Lincoln. Trait theories, on the other hand, removed specific people from the picture and focused on *leadership traits* that made a difference between success and failure. Van Seters and Field (1990) explained that because those theories failed to find a single set of leadership traits that worked in all circumstances, the "Personality Era" theories were considered too simplistic and "have virtually become extinct" (p. 30).

Van Seters and Field's (1990) assessment, however, may have been premature. Instead, the elusive search for leadership traits gained momentum in the 90s. For instance, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) argued, "successful leaders are not like other people," (p. 49) exhibiting more honesty, self-confidence, drive, business knowledge, and cognitive ability than non-leaders. The first three characteristics are personality traits. The fourth characteristic – business knowledge – is arguably *impacted* by personality. After all, a focused and disciplined individual is more likely to amass business knowledge. The relationship between the fifth characteristic (cognitive ability) and personality is yet uncertain – results of studies attempting to connect these two dimensions have so far been contradictory (Mõttus, 2006).

Thus, while personality studies were once discarded, researchers have rekindled the interest in the predictive role of personality on job performance (Stevens & Ash, 2001). This renewed focus in personality acknowledges the insight personality could provide into behavioral tendencies (Berr, Chuck, & Waclawski, 2000) and job related behaviors (Berr et al. 2000).

One problem that plagued early trait theorists interested in personality, however, was an excessive variability in terminology. The consolidation of the Five Factor Model (FFM) has provided researchers with a useful solution (McCormack & Mellor, 2002). The FFM is a taxonomy of personality traits clustered around five groups: (a) need for stability (also called neuroticism and emotional stability), (b) extraversion, (c) originality (also called openness to experiences), (d) accommodation (also called agreeableness), and (e) consolidation (also called conscientiousness).

Armed with a manageable personality model, numerous researchers attempted to connect the FFM with job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Ployhart, Lim, & Chan, 2001; Judge & Bono, 2000). In particular, various researchers (Judge & Bono, 2000; Howard & Howard, 2001c; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; McCormack & Mellor, 2002; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Oh & Berry, 2009) connected personality and leadership. For instance, Howard and Howard (2001c) suggested that the "ideal" leader is calm and resilient (low need for stability), outgoing (high extraversion), visionary (high originality), challenging (low accommodation), and focused on his goals (high consolidation).

Interestingly, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) did not *directly* tie traits and leadership effectiveness. Instead, they suggested an *indirect* relationship. Traits acted as preconditions to certain actions which could, in turn, enhance effectiveness. In spite of this "indirect relationship," Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) suggested that individuals who possessed certain traits could have an advantage over those who did not. In other words, leadership could be more *natural* for some individuals.   Personality traits, however, are distributed in a normal curve (Howard & Howard, 2001b). By definition, therefore, not everyone will exhibit the typical "leadership" traits suggested by Howard and Howard (2001c). Further, the specific roles occupied by HR professionals could be supported by different personality traits.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Within the context of the foregoing discussion, the purpose of this study was to explore the fabric of the personality of HR professionals. First, this study investigated differences in the personality traits of HR generalists, managers, and executives. Second, this study sought to contrast the personalities of HR professionals and non-HR executives. The following questions were examined in this study:

1. How do the personalities of HR generalists, managers, and executives differ?

2. How do the personalities of HR professionals and non-HR executives differ?

The following definitions for the terms need for stability, extraversion, originality, accommodation, and consolidation offered by Howard and Howard (2001a) were used in this research report:

*   *Need for stability* means our level of resilience to stress.

*   *Extraversion* means our tolerance for sensory bombardment, the level of social interaction that we crave.

*   *Originality* means our focus on innovation versus efficiency, our interest in the "new and untested" versus the "tried and true."

*   *Accommodation* means the way that we react to conflicts or disagreements, our tendency to "stand our ground," "seek middle ground," or submit to others' wishes.

*   *Consolidation* means our level of spontaneity and flexibility versus our tendency towards discipline and a focus on predefined goals.

The following definitions of variables are offered by the authors:

*   *HR generalists* have a broad spectrum of responsibilities ranging from staffing, training and developing employees at all levels, managing a diverse workforce, to developing and maintaining personnel policies and procedures. Generalists may range from entry level to department or branch manager. In this study, however, HR generalists are HR professionals whose roles encompass a broad range of HR functions and excludes those classified as managers.

*   *HR managers* are HR professionals who are also responsible for managing staff.

*   *HR executives* are HR professionals occupying director or vice president roles.

*   *Non-HR executives* are professionals from outside the HR field who occupy director or vice president roles.

For the purposes of this study, the researchers assumed that certain competencies best support the activities carried out by (a) various levels of leadership (Charan et al., 2001) and (b) various levels or functions of HR service (SHRM, 2011). The researchers further assumed that personality contributes to competency development (Howard & Howard, 2001b). However, the current study was intended to be *descriptive* rather than *prescriptive*. The authors did not seek to identify personality factors that lead to the emergence of HR leaders or predicate HR leadership effectiveness. After all, a competency is "a domain of human talent that can be developed in adulthood" (Boyatzis, 2008, p. 10). Further, the expression of a competency depends not only on existing traits but also on the individual's intentions (Boyatzis, 2008), knowledge, and acquired skills (McEvoy et al., 2005). Thus, personality is likely to *contribute to* but not *determine* the manifestation of HR competencies.

Methods

The study data were obtained from two sources. First, primary data were collected by the authors through Linked:HR, a public and international online social networking group for human resource professionals (Linked:HR, 2010). At the time of the survey, Linked:HR included more than 300,000 members (Linked:HR, 2010). An online survey including personality questions (Howard & Howard, 2001a) was electronically sent to all Linked:HR members. Henceforward, the researchers will refer to this data as "Sample 1."

Second, the researchers analyzed archival data collected by The Center for Applied Cognitive Studies (CentACS, 2011). CentACS (2011) provides online administration of the WorkPlace Big Five Profile (Howard & Howard, 2001a) assessments to independent consultants and organizations. The assessments were administered for a variety of purposes including leadership development, coaching, team building, selection, career planning, and succession planning. The CentACS (2011) database included personality data from professionals in multiple job areas such as accounting, consulting, engineering, informational systems, human resources, and senior management. Henceforward, the researchers will refer to this data as "Sample 2."

Data Preparation

Sample 1.

A total of 3,608 responses were received from Linked:HR members. The following filters were then applied to results: (a) only surveys completed by participants residing in the United States were selected; and (b) all cases containing missing personality data were eliminated. Further, in accordance with the purpose of the study, only the following HR positions were retained: HR executives, HR managers, and HR generalists. Thus filtered, the total sample included 1,184 participants.

Sample 2.

The original CentACS database included a total of 7,139 cases. From the original dataset, the researchers selected surveys completed by participants who worked in the United States and who considered the United States a "primary country of identity." International responses were reserved for a subsequent study. Further, all cases involving missing personality or job category data were eliminated. 5,431 cases remained. The researchers then visually inspected the data to review self-reported job categories. The data were "cleaned" by eliminating cases in which either personality data or job category were missing. Subjects who indicated both HR and another job category were classified as HR. From the data, two groups were selected: human resources (290 cases) and non-hr executives (651 cases).

Instrumentation

The instrument selected for this research was the Workplace Big Five Profile™ 3.0 or WPB5 (Howard & Howard, 2001a), an instrument developed specifically for workplace applications such as coaching, leadership development, and personnel selection. The short form of this instrument (completed by participants in Sample 1) includes 40 items and can be completed in approximately 10 minutes. The long form of this instrument (completed by participants in Sample 2) includes 118 items and can be completed in approximately 20 minutes. Raw scores are computed by adding the values for the items related to each personality trait. Such scores can then be transformed into standardized scores by following a conversion chart provided by the WPB5 Professional Manual (Howard & Howard, 2001b).

Howard and Howard (2001b) reported an average coefficient alpha for the long form of the instrument of .81. The average coefficient alpha for the short form of the instrument was .77. Convergent validity can be inferred from a correspondence between the WPB5 and the instrument currently considered the standard for FFM research – the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Howard and Howard (2001b) reported correlation scores between 103 sets of the WPB5 (long form) and the NEO PI-R (see Table 2). The lowest reported correlation was reported between the WPB5 accommodation score and the NEO PI-R agreeableness ($r = .27$). Howard and Howard (2001c) theorized that accommodation personality traits may be adaptive to contingencies of "power and hierarchy" (p. 51) found at work.

Results

The first question was: How do the personalities of HR generalists, managers, and executives differ? Sample 1 was used to answer this question.

Five ANOVAS were run, one for each personality trait. The independent variable was rank (HR executive, manager, and generalist). Hochberg's Post Hoc tests (indicated when sample sizes are different as per Field, 2010) were run to compare the means for the three groups. The dependent variables were each of the five personality traits. Table 3 includes the means and standard deviations for each of the five traits for the three positions, Table 4 includes ANOVA results, and Table 5 reports on the Hochberg's Post Hoc test results. The results were as follows:

- There was a significant effect of rank on need for stability $F (2,1181) = 12.006$, p = .00, ω = .14. Hochberg's Post Hoc comparisons among the three groups indicate that HR executives had significantly lower need for stability (M = 44.08) than managers (M = 46.05) and generalists (M = 46.75).

- There was a significant effect of rank on extraversion $F (2,1181) = 12.341$, p = .00, ω = .14. Hochberg's Post Hoc comparisons among the three groups indicate that HR executives (M = 54.32) and managers (M = 53.27) had significantly higher extraversion than generalists (M = 51.21).

- There was a significant effect of rank on originality $F (2,1181) = 35.702$, p = .00, ω = .24. Hochberg's Post Hoc comparisons among the three groups indicate that HR executives (M = 51.31) had significantly higher originality than managers (M = 48.82) and generalists (M = 46.56) and managers had significantly higher originality than generalists.

- There was a significant effect of rank on accommodation $F (2,1181) = 8.682$, p = .000, ω = .10. Hochberg's Post Hoc comparisons among the three groups indicate that HR executives (M =

47.32) had significantly lower accommodation than managers (M = 49.39) and generalists (M = 49.65).

- There was no significant effect of rank on consolidation, *Welch* (422.99, 82718.29) = 3.02, p = .051.

The second question was: What is the difference between the personalities of HR professionals and non-HR executives? Sample 2 was used to answer this question.

Five T-tests were run to investigate differences in need for stability, extraversion, originality, accommodation, and consolidation for HR professionals (N = 290) and non-HR executives (N = 651). Table 6 lists the means for each of the personality traits for the two categories. Table 7 shares the results of the independent T-tests run for each personality trait.

The following is a summary of the results:

- There were significant differences in need for stability between HR professionals (M = 52.68, SD = 9.58) and non-HR executives (M = 49.44, SD = 8.58); t(4.92), p = .00. This difference represented a small effect (r = .20).

- There were significant differences in extraversion between HR professionals (M = 49.5, SD = 7.71) and non-HR executives (M = 51.69, SD = 6.79); t(-4.15), p = .00). This difference represented a small effect (r = .17).

- There were significant differences in originality between HR professionals (M = 54.59, SD = 9.61) and non-HR executives (M = 50.67, SD = 8.57); t(-7.68), p = .00). This difference represented a small effect (r = .23).

- There were significant differences in accommodation between HR professionals (M = 50.67, SD = 10.66) and non-HR executives (M = 46.84, SD = 9.8); t(5.387), p = .00. This difference represented a small effect (r = .16).

- There were significant differences in consolidation between HR professionals (M = 48.08, SD = 9.4) and non-HR executives (M = 49.54, SD = 8.38); t(-2.273), p = .02. This difference represented a small effect (r = .10).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study partially supported the overall profile of leaders presented by Howard and Howard (2001c), Judge et al (2002), and Oh and Berry (2009). Howard and Howard (2001c) suggested that the "ideal" leader is calm and resilient (low need for stability), outgoing (high extraversion), visionary (high originality), challenging (low accommodation), and focused on his goals (high consolidation).

First, HR executives in this study appeared to be calmer (have lower need for stability) than managers and generalists. On the other hand, non-HR executives were calmer than HR professionals. These results, however, could simply indicate differences in rank rather than differences in field of work. A sample including both HR and non-HR professionals with the same managerial rank would be needed to test this hypothesis.

Second, HR executives and managers surpassed their generalist colleagues in extraversion. Extraversion had previously been identified as having a positive relationship to leadership (Howard & Howard, 2001c; Oh and Berry, 2009). Later, a meta analytic study on leaderless groups by Ensari, Riggio, Christian, and Carslaw (2011) found higher extraversion to be predictive of leader emergence. The same may be true of the HR profession. Again, the differences between HR professionals and non-HR executives, who were more extraverted, may be partially accounted for by the fact that the HR sample also included lower ranking professionals. Further investigation is required to assess the validity of this proposition.

Third, originality scores increased with participants' rank. A possible explanation is that originality contributes to senior-level HR competencies such as strategic thinking, effective communications, cross-cultural intelligence, analytical thinking, and leading change. Further, originality could support the broad learning required at the upper echelons of an organization (Charan et al., 2001). The day-to-day operations of HR work at lower levels of the organization, on the other hand, could require higher comfort with detailed and precise work. Comfort with detail, characterizes those whose originality is low (Howard & Howard, 2001b).

Interestingly, the originality scores of non-HR executives were *higher* than those of HR professionals. The identified difference could be rank-related. After all, senior leaders must be able to see the organization holistically and systemically (Bonn, 2001). These results, however, could be relevant as HR professionals are called to take on a strategic role (Roehling et al., 2005). Strategic thinking, after all, has been connected to originality (Howard & Howard, 2001c). These results warrant further investigation.

The study did, however, present somewhat surprising results in two trait areas: accommodation and consolidation. First, accommodation scores in the current study differed for HR executives and managers/generalists and for HR professionals and non-HR executives. Indeed, non-HR professionals and HR executives were more challenging (lower accommodation). These results are consistent with Howard and Howard's (2001b) assertion that accommodation levels of senior leaders tend to be low. A possible explanation: Organizational members may perceive high accommodation individuals as naïve, conforming, or passive (Judge et al., 2002). Such perceptions could then hinder the progress of high accommodation professionals in executive positions.

Curiously, accommodation did not differentiate managers and generalists in this study. Instead, accommodation seemed to "matter" to upper level executives only. Possibly, lower accommodation scores support HR executives' ability to "hold their own" during organization-wide negotiations and interactions with other business leaders. Similar requirements may not exist for HR managers and generalists. The impact of accommodation on HR professionals' ability to "have a seat at the table" (Schuler & Jackson, 2005, p. 19) with the organization's top leaders may warrant further study.

Second, this study revealed intriguing findings on consolidation. Howard and Howard (2001c) had reported higher consolidation scores for upper echelon leaders. This study, however, failed to identify significant differences in the consolidation scores of HR executives, managers, and generalists. There were, however, significant differences between HR professionals and non-HR executives – the latter presented significantly higher consolidation scores.

Consolidation may present HR professionals with a "double edged sword." A certain level of "focus" and methodicalness may be helpful to HR professionals as their work could involve policy-driven administrative and operational work (Ulrich et al., 2007). On the other hand, HR professionals must remain flexible as they negotiate "the needs of multiple stakeholders" (Schuler & Jackson, 2005). Flexibility is also warranted as HR professionals "adjust the approach as required by shifts within the organization and in the external business environment" (SHRM, 2011, p. 4). Flexibility is often connected

to low consolidation (Howard & Howard, 2001c). Such flexibility needs may explain the lower consolidation scores of HR professionals identified in this study.

Though confirming some findings of previous research, this study went further by focusing on differences among HR professionals. The findings could have potential implications for the development and mentoring of HR leaders. Further research, however, is needed to explore the role of personality on HR leader emergence and career progression.

LIMITATIONS

The survey for sample one was deployed on the Internet. Respondents to Internet and web-based surveys may be limited to those with Internet access that are comfortable with computers (and completing web-based-surveys) and are motivated to participate in the study (Ray & Tabor, 2003). The possibility thus exists that those without Internet access or uncomfortable with completing web based surveys may not have been captured in the survey. Thus, an inherent assumption is that the personalities of these two populations of HR professionals do not differ significantly from one another. This is perhaps a hypothesis for future research investigation.

Sample one was also limited to HR professionals who were members of Linked:HR. Human Resource professionals who were not members of Linked:HR were precluded from the study thus introducing possible self-selection bias. Other questions surrounding issues in web-based surveys such as problems with technology cannot be totally eliminated. These must be acknowledged with the recognition that sampling bias cannot be totally eliminated from any medium.

Sample one was a subset of a larger sample of 3,608 responses, which may be reflective of a low response rate. The total sample size (members on Linked:HR) at the time of the survey was over 300,000. On the other hand, the number of *registered* site users is likely to exceed the number of *active* site users. The number of active users could not be ascertained.

The use of archival data for sample two also presents some limitations. The data was not originally gathered for research proposes or to answer the questions posed by the researchers. It was previously noted that different forms of the same instrument were used in samples one and two, which might affect the comparability of the data sets. Furthermore, "by definition, archival data are old data" (Jones, 2010, p. 1013). As such, the population of executives may not be representative of the executives at the time of collection of sample two. Moreover, the archival data was collected over an extended period of time further complicating the comparability of the data.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Some of the comparisons between HR professionals and Non-HR executives yielded interesting results. Future research comparing HR and Non-HR executives of the same rank may provide more insight into these issues. Such comparisons were not run in the current study because differing forms of the instruments were used in the two samples. Thus, studies using a single instrument collected at a single point in time (or longitudinally) might yield more valid comparisons.

This study identified possible connections between personality and rank among HR professionals. Further, the study suggested possible differences in personality between HR professionals and non-HR executives. A qualitative or mixed-methods research design, however, may be need to further explore such connections. Qualitative studies could help explain why and how personality impacts the careers and relationships of HR professionals.

In summary, this study contributed to understanding of the "fabric" of the HR professional. Such "fabric" could contribute to or hinder the development of the HR "21st century" competencies (Boyatzis, 2008, p. 5). This study, however, did not collect competency data. An exploration of the links between competencies and personalities in a single study would provide more comprehensive data and test the assumed relationships between personality and HR competencies as per Table 1.

REFERENCES

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 1-26.

Berr, S. A., Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (2000). The right relationship is everything: Linking personality preferences to managerial behaviors. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 11(2),* 133-157.

Bonn, I. I. (2001). Developing strategic thinking as a core competency. *Management Decision, 39*(1), 63-70.

Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development, 27*(1), 5-12.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 5-13. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.5

Center for Applied Cognitive Studies (2011). *Personality data*. Retrieved May 2011 from http://www.centacs.com.

Charan, R., Drotter, S. &, Noel, J. (2001). *The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership powered company*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collings, D. G., & Wood, G. (2009). *Human resource management: A critical approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ensari, N., Riggio, R. E., Christian, J., & Carslaw, G. (2011). Who emerges as a leader? Meta-analyses of individual differences as predictors of leadership emergence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51 (2011)*, 532–536

Howard, P., & Howard, J. (2001a). *Workplace BigFive Profile™ 3.0*. Charlotte, NC: CentACS.

Howard, P., & Howard, J. (2001b). *WorkPlace BigFive Profile™ 3.0 Professional Manual*. Charlotte, NC: CentACS.

Howard, P., & Howard, J. (2001c). *The owner's manual for personality at work*. Marietta, GA: Bard Press.

Jones, C. (2010). Archival data: Advantages and disadvantages for research in psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4 (11)*, 1008-1017.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology 85*(5), 751-765.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765-780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5(2),* 48-60.

Lim, B., & Ployhart, R. E. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 610-621. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.610

Linked: HR (2010). *Human resources engagement survey*. Deployed April 14, 2010 on http://www.linkedhr.com.

McCormack, L., & Mellor, D. (2002). The role of personality in leadership: An application of the five-factor model in the Australian military. *Military Psychology, 14*(3), 179-197.

McCroskey, J., Heisel, A., & Richmond, V. (2001). Eysenck's big three and communication traits: Three correlational studies. *Communication Monographs, 68*(4), 360-366.

McEvoy, G., Hayton, J., Warnick, A., Mumford, T., Hanks, S., & Blahna, M. (2005). A competency-based model for developing human resource professionals. *Journal of Management Education 29*(3), 383-402.

Mõttus, R. (2006). Investigating personality in different levels of cognitive ability. *Baltic Journal of Psychology, 7*(1), 60-67.

Noe, R., Hollenbeck, J., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. (2010). *Human resource management: Getting a competitive advantage*. (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Oh, I., & Berry, C. M. (2009). The five-factor model of personality and managerial performance: Validity gains through the use of 360 degree performance ratings. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1498-1513.

Pilenzo, R. C. (2009). A new paradigm for HR. *Organization Development Journal, 27*(3), 63-75.

Ployhart, R. E., Lim, B., & Chan, K. (2001). Exploring relations between typical and maximum performance ratings and the five factor model of personality. *Personnel Psychology, 54*(4), 809-844.

Ray, N. M., & Tabor, S.W. (2003). Several issue s affect e-research validity. *Marketing News*, September 13, 2003, 50-53.

Roehling, M., Boswell, W., Caligiuri, P., Feldman, D., Graham, M., Guthrie, M., Guthrie, J., Morishima, M., & Tansky, J. (2005). The future of HR management: Research needs and directions. *Human Resource Management, 44*(2), 207-216.

Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (2005). A quarter-century review of human resource management in the US: The growth in importance of the international perspective. *Management Review, 16*(1), 11-35.

Scroggins, W. A. (2008). The relationship between employee fit perceptions, job performance, and retention: Implications of perceived fit. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 20*(1), 57-71. doi:10.1007/s10672-007-9060-0

Society for Human Resource Management - SHRM (2008). *Choosing a career: Choose HR* . Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management Retrieved June 11, 2011 from: http://www.shrm.org.

Society for Human Resources Management - SHRM (2011). *What senior HR leaders need to know: Perspectives from the United States, Canada, India, The Middle East and North Africa*. Retrieved 9/3/2011, 2011, from http://www.shrm.org/Research/SurveyFindings/Articles/Pages/WhatSrHRLeadersNeedtoKnow.aspx.

Stevens, C. D., & Ash, R. A. (2001). Selecting Employees For Fit: Personality And Preferred Managerial Style. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *13*(4), 500.

Ulrich, D., & Brockbank, W. (2005). *The HR value proposition*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Ulrich, D., Brockbank, W., Johnson, D., & Younger, J. (2007). Human resource competencies: Responding to increased expectations. *Employment Relations Today, 34*(3), 1-12.

Ulrich, D., Brockbank, W, Johnson, D., Sandholtz, K., & Younger, J. (2008). *HR competencies: Mastery at the intersection of people and business proposition*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.

Van Seters, D., & Field, R. H. (1990). The evolution of leadership theory. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *3*(3), 29-45.

York, K. (2010). *Applied human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX

Table 1
HR Competencies, Possible Connections to Traits

Competency	Authors	Traits **				
		N	E	O	A	C
Analytical Thinking*	SHRM, 2011			+		
Business / Financial	McEvoy et al., 2005	–	+	–	–	+
Coaching*	McEvoy et al., 2005; SHRM, 2011	–	+	+	+	+
Communications*	SHRM, 2011	–	+			
Credibility/Integrity*	McEvoy et al., 2005; Ulrich et al., 2007; SHRM, 2011	_			+	+
Cross-Cultural *	SHRM, 2011	–		+	+	
Flexibility*	SHRM, 2011	–	+	+	+	–
Integrity*	SHRM, 2011					
Leading Change*	McEvoy et al., 2005; Ulrich et al., 2007; SHRM, 2011	–	+	+	=	–
Strategic Thinking*	McEvoy et al., 2005; Ulrich et al., 2007; SHRM, 2011;	–	+	+		+
Talent Management	Ulrich et al., 2007					
Technical / Operational	McEvoy et al., 2005; Ulrich et al., 2007					

Note. * indicates senior level competencies. The competencies are listed in alphabetical order. **N = need for stability; E = extraversion; O = originality; A = accommodation, and C = consolidation. All competency / trait connections with the exception of *communications* were inferred from Howard & Howard's Competency Formulas for the Workplace Big Five Profile (2001b, pp. 86-91). The *communications* competency-trait connections were inferred from McCroskey, Heisel, & Richmond (2001). The following symbols apply to the traits: + (high), = (medium), and – (low).

Table 2
Correlation between the WPB5 and the NEO PI-R

Trait	R
Need for Stability	.61
Extraversion	.73
Originality	.55
Accommodation	.27
Consolidation	.6

Note. Adapted from "Professional Manual for the Workplace Big Five Profile™," by Howard and J. M. Howard, 2001b.

Table 3
Sample 1: Personality Means and Standard Deviations

		M	SD
HR Director or Vice President (1)	Need for Stability	44.0798	7.84026
N = 501	Extraversion	54.3333	7.98315
42.3%	Originality	51.3074	7.19342
	Accommodation	47.3154	8.89968
	Consolidation	50.9022	8.8544
HR Managers (2)	Need for Stability	46.049	7.68586
N = 469	Extraversion	53.2814	7.59848
39.6%	Originality	48.8337	7.08089
	Accommodation	49.3881	8.77294
	Consolidation	50.6162	7.70987
HR Generalist (3)	Need for Stability	46.7617	7.99673
N = 214	Extraversion	51.2056	7.34238
18.1%	Originality	46.5467	7.51369
	Accommodation	49.6636	8.87095
	Consolidation	52.2804	8.58517

Table 4
Sample 1: ANOVA Results for Need for Stability, Extraversion, Originality, Accommodation, and Consolidation

		Analysis of Variances				Levene's Test			
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Levene's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig
Need for Stability	Between Groups	1463.87	2	731.93	12.01	0.00	0.14	2	1181	0.86
	Within Groups	72001.53	1181	60.97						
	Total	73465.41	1183							
Extraversion	Between Groups	1470.70	2	735.34	12.33	0.00	0.69	2	1181	0.50
	Within Groups	70369.14	1181	59.57						
	Total	71839.84	1183							
Originality	Between Groups	3709.98	2	1854.10	35.70	0.00	0.60	2	1181	0.54
	Within Groups	61362.71	1181	51.96						
	Total	65072.72	1183							
Accommodation	Between Groups	1358.29	2	679.14	8.67	0.00	0.07	2	1181	0.92
	Within Groups	92383.32	1181	78.23						
	Total	93741.61	1183							
Consolidation	Between Groups	422.99	2	211.48	3.02	0.051	3.27	2	1181	0.04
	Within Groups	82718.29	1181	70.03						
	Total	83141.29	1183							

	Welch's Statistics	df1	df2	Sig.
	2.99	2	572.67	0.051

Note. Since Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances was significant for Consolidation, the Welch's F Statistic was considered. Since the Welch results are not significant for Consolidation, Post Hoc Test results for that trait were not reported.

Table 5
Sample 1: Hochberg Post Hoc Tests for Need for Stability, Extraversion, Originality, Accommodation, and Consolidation

	(I) Position	(J) Position	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Need for Stability	Executives	Managers	-1.97*	.50	.00
		Generalists	-2.67*	.64	.00
	Managers	Executives	1.97*	.50	.00
		Generalists	-.70	.63	.61
	Generalists	Executives	2.67*	.64	.00
		Managers	.70	.63	.61
Extraversion	Executives	Managers	1.04	.50	.10
		Generalists	3.13*	.62	.00
	Managers	Executives	-1.04	.50	.10
		Generalists	2.08*	.64	.00
	Generalists	Executives	-3.13*	.62	.00
		Managers	-2.08*	.64	.00
Originality	Executives	Managers	2.46*	.45	.00
		Generalists	4.75*	.59	.00
	Managers	Executives	-2.46*	.45	.00
		Generalists	2.29*	.58	.00
	Generalists	Executives	-4.75*	.59	.00
		Managers	-2.29*	.58	.00
Accommodation	Executives	Managers	-2.06*	.57	.00
		Generalists	-2.35*	.71	.00
	Managers	Executives	2.06*	.57	.00
		Generalists	-.28	.73	.98
	Generalists	Executives	2.35*	.71	.00
		Managers	.28	.73	.98

Note. * indicates that the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. .00 indicates very small non-zero results.

Table 6
Sample 2: Personality Means, HR Professionals, non-HR Executives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
N	HR	290	52.68	9.58
	Non-HR Executives	651	49.44	8.58
E	HR	290	49.5	7.71
	Non-HR Executives	651	51.69	6.79
O	HR	290	49.76	9.61
	Non-HR Executives	651	54.59	8.57
A	HR	290	50.67	10.66
	Non-HR Executives	651	46.84	9.80
C	HR	290	48.08	9.40
	Non-HR Executives	651	49.54	8.38

Table 7
Sample 2: T-Test Results

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F	Sig.	t	df	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
N	5.17	.01	4.92	503.00	.00	3.24	.66
E	8.46	.00	-4.15	496.16	.00	-2.19	.53
O	1.93	.17	-7.68	939.00	.00	-4.83	.63
A	1.40	.24	5.39	939.00	.00	3.84	.70
C	4.41	.04	-2.26	502.82	.01	-1.46	.63

Note. Since Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was significant for N, E, and C, equal variances were NOT assumed for those traits. Equal variances were assumed for O and A. .00 values indicate very small non-zero results.