



## **Personality Change: Implications for Organizational Behavior**

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Annals</i>
Manuscript ID	ANNALS-2016-0008.R4
Document Type:	Article
Keywords:	PERSONALITY, ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR, PSYCHOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **PERSONALITY CHANGE:**  
4  
5 **IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Stefano Tasselli**

13  
14 Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University  
15  
16 Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands  
17  
18 [tasselli@rsm.nl](mailto:tasselli@rsm.nl)  
19

20  
21 **Martin Kilduff**

22  
23 UCL School of Management, University College London  
24  
25 1 Canada Square, E14 5AA London, United Kingdom  
26  
27 [m.kilduff@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:m.kilduff@ucl.ac.uk)  
28

29  
30 **Blaine Landis**

31  
32 UCL School of Management, University College London  
33  
34 1 Canada Square, E14 5AA London, United Kingdom  
35  
36 [b.landis@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:b.landis@ucl.ac.uk)  
37

38  
39  
40  
41 In press in the *Academy of Management Annals*  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Acknowledgments: We thank Matthew Cronin and Daan van Knippenberg for their editorial guidance,  
49 and two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions. The paper benefited from comments from reading  
50 groups and discussions at the UCL School of Management; and Rotterdam School of Management,  
51 Erasmus University.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

## **PERSONALITY CHANGE: IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR**

10  
11

### **ABSTRACT:**

12 The paper focuses on an emergent debate in organizational behavior concerning personality  
13 stability and change. We introduce foundational psychological research concerning whether  
14 individual personality, in terms of traits, needs, and personal constructs, is fixed or changeable.  
15  
16 Based on this background, we review recent research evidence on the antecedents and outcomes  
17 associated with personality change. We build on this review of personality change to introduce  
18 new directions for personality research in organizational behavior. Specifically, we discuss how  
19 a view of personality as changeable contributes to key topics for organizational behavior  
20 research, and how this new approach can help broaden and deepen the scope of personality  
21 theory and measurement. The study of personality change offers a range of new ideas and  
22 research opportunities for the study of organizational behavior.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38

### **KEYWORDS:**

39 Personality Change; Personality Stability; Traits; Needs; Personal Constructs; Self-Development;  
40 Organizational Events; External Events; Outcomes of Personality Change; Organizational  
41 Research.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We live in an age in which people plan, pursue, and experience individual changes that  
4 affect career and life trajectories. People improve their educational credentials, change  
5 residences, move jobs, switch nationalities, and undergo gender reassignment. All of this is  
6 familiar to organizational researchers. But evidence and theory concerning personality change  
7 are only just emerging in the organizational behavior research landscape, despite personality  
8 psychology findings (see Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006, for a meta-analysis),  
9 practitioner attention (e.g., Alicke & Sedikides, 2011), and mass media interest (e.g., Soto,  
10 2016). Organizational research (e.g., Dalal, Meyer, Bradshaw, Green, Kelly, & Zhu, 2015; Li,  
11 Barrick, Zimmerman, & Chiaburu, 2014) emphasizes the stability of personality (e.g., McCrae &  
12 Costa, 2003, 2008) rather than change of personality. There has been neglect of the possibility  
13 that personality can change, and neglect of when and how such changes occur.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 The view of personality as a stable aspect of the individual self has contributed greatly to  
29 the understanding of human behavior in organizations (Roberts, Kuncel, Shiner, Caspi, &  
30 Goldberg, 2007). Personality, as a stable set of traits, represents a core construct, as discussed in  
31 numerous reviews (e.g., Schmitt, 2014), special issues (e.g., Casciaro, Barsade, Edmondson,  
32 Gibson, Krackhardt, & Labianca, 2015), and chapters in almost every organizational behavior  
33 textbook (e.g., Robbins & Judge, 2017). Stability in personality matters for organizations  
34 because it helps us understand people's behavior in many work-related domains, including  
35 employee performance (Grant & Parker, 2009; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; Organ,  
36 Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2010; Parker & Collins, 2010), social networks (e.g., Feiler &  
37 Kleinbaum, 2015; Klein, Lim, Saltz, & Mayer, 2004; Landis, 2016), employee withdrawal  
38 (Sackett, 2002; Zimmermann, 2008), and employee retention (Li, Fay, Frese, Harms, & Gao,  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2014). In all of this research, there has been an explicit or implicit emphasis on the stability of  
4  
5 personality.  
6

7  
8 A view of personality as changeable challenges current perspectives in organizational  
9  
10 behavior. For researchers, treating personality as changeable allows consideration of the effects  
11  
12 of self-development, organizational events, and external events and processes on individuals'  
13  
14 work-related dispositions (e.g., Boyce, Wood, Daly, & Sedikides, 2015). In place of an exclusive  
15  
16 focus on personality as a fixed attribute of individuals, researchers can consider personality  
17  
18 change as a dependent variable. Personality can be considered as a set of attributes that can be  
19  
20 modified by events and processes. An emphasis on changeable personality has implications for  
21  
22 numerous areas of inquiry, including leadership (e.g., Balkundi, Kilduff, & Harrison, 2011),  
23  
24 personality-fit research (e.g., Schneider, Smith, Taylor, & Fleenor, 1998), task design (e.g., Lodi-  
25  
26 Smith & Roberts, 2007), personnel selection and development (e.g., Harms, Spain, & Hannah,  
27  
28 2011), and job performance (e.g., Deinert, Homan, Boer, Voelpel, & Gutermann, 2015). Even  
29  
30 modest changes in personality traits can result in "profound" consequences for individuals  
31  
32 (Roberts, Wood, & Caspi, 2008: 383). For consumers of organizational behavior research, such  
33  
34 as students and managers, treating personal characteristics as changeable promotes a  
35  
36 developmental mindset linked to resilience, low stress, and achievement (e.g., Yeager & Dweck,  
37  
38 2012).  
39

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Personality change in organizational behavior has been neglected, in part, because  
researchers have tended to render such change "impossible by definition" (Gendlin, 1964: 101).  
Research on the Big Five personality taxonomy (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to  
experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) characterizes these traits as "the basic  
dispositions that . . . endure through adulthood" (McCrae & Costa, 2003: 3). Similarly, in

1  
2  
3 organizational behavior research, the emphasis on the stability of personality is relatively  
4  
5 ubiquitous. Thus, a recent review states that personality traits “reflect an individual’s enduring  
6  
7 patterns of cognition, motivation, and behavior exhibited across contexts” (Li, Fay, Frese,  
8  
9 Harms, & Gao, 2014).

10  
11  
12 In our review, we balance this emphasis on personality stability with a review of ideas  
13  
14 and evidence concerning personality change. We draw from the debate in organization and  
15  
16 management research contrasting stability and change. This debate permeates management  
17  
18 research at the macro level (e.g., organizational ecology vs. strategic choice) and at the  
19  
20 organizational level, where identity is either seen as enduring (e.g., Albert & Whetten, 1985) or  
21  
22 identity is seen as emergent (e.g., Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). At the level of individual  
23  
24 persons, organizational behavior scholars have reacted to the critiques of personality research  
25  
26 from psychologists (e.g., Mischel, 1973, 2004) and organizational researchers (e.g., Davis-Blake  
27  
28 & Pfeffer, 1989; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) by championing the stability over time of personality  
29  
30 and related constructs (e.g., Gerhart, 2005; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). The time is ripe for a  
31  
32 consideration of the other side of the coin – theory and evidence concerning personality change.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 There are many different approaches to personality. The list incorporates traits (e.g.,  
39  
40 Allport, 1937; Barrick & Mount, 1991), biology (e.g., Dabbs, Hargrove, & Heusel, 1996),  
41  
42 psychoanalysis (e.g., Baumeister, Dale, & Sommer, 1998), humanistic approaches (e.g., Maslow,  
43  
44 1954; Rogers, 1947, 2012), motivation (e.g., McClelland, 1965), social learning (e.g., Rotter,  
45  
46 1954), and cognitive approaches (e.g., Kelly, 1955; Mischel, 1973), among others. We adopt a  
47  
48 contemporary theorist’s definition that captures the whole spectrum of the person’s individuality  
49  
50 rather than just one slice of personality theory and research: “Personality refers to an individual’s  
51  
52 characteristic pattern of thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mechanisms – hidden or not – behind these patterns” (Funder, 1997: 1–2). Thus, *personality*  
4 *change* refers to change in the individual’s characteristic pattern of thought, emotion, or behavior  
5  
6 as well as change to the mechanisms behind these patterns.  
7  
8  
9

10 This review includes empirical, conceptual, meta-analytic, and review papers published  
11 between 2006 and 2017 from journals in management, sociology, psychology, and related fields.  
12 We searched for relevant articles using combinations of the following search terms: personality  
13 change/personality dynamics/psychological change. We concentrated our search on journals  
14 regarded as primary outlets in their field, and we also included specialist journals as appropriate.  
15 Because this is the first paper concerning personality change in relation to organizational  
16 behavior, we also delved into prior research to provide context for contemporary developments.  
17 We have striven to bring a comprehensive perspective to bear on what has been a much-  
18 neglected research arena. We necessarily draw heavily from personality psychology research  
19 given the paucity of work in organizational behavior that considers personality change.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 We structure the review in three major sections. First, we present a brief history of  
34 personality change theory and research. Second, we review the antecedents of personality change  
35 in terms of self-development, organizational events and processes, and external events and  
36 processes that impinge on organizational careers. Third, we articulate an overarching framework  
37 that can guide future research.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Brief History**

45 There has long been interest in the question of whether individuals are fixed or  
46 changeable in their dispositions. Theory and evidence can be adduced to favor one or the other  
47 perspective. As David McClelland was moved to comment on the stark divide in personality  
48 research on the topic of personality change: “A man from Mars might be led to believe that  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 personality change appears to be very difficult for those who think it is very difficult, if not  
4 impossible, and much easier for those who think it can be done” (McClelland, 1965: 322). As  
5  
6 with people in general (Dweck, 1999, 2008), personality theories differ as to whether they view  
7  
8 personality change as integral to human beings (e.g., personal construct theory – Kelly, 1955) or  
9  
10 whether they view personality as consisting of relatively stable entities (e.g., the Big Five trait  
11  
12 approach) (Pervin, 1994). On the side of the stability of personality, the theory of humors,  
13  
14 according to which people’s temperaments are rooted in their physiology, dates back to ancient  
15  
16 Greece, but has continued to fascinate researchers throughout history and continues to play a role  
17  
18 in contemporary research on personality stability (e.g., Rothbart, Ahadi, & Evans, 2000). On the  
19  
20 side of personality change, there is an equally distinguished lineage, deriving from the theory of  
21  
22 Heraclitus concerning how people, influenced by the river of life, are constantly in the flux of  
23  
24 change (Sabelli & Carlson-Sabelli, 1989). And people have been depicted as mutating toward  
25  
26 one of many selves depending on the character of the groups to which they address themselves  
27  
28 (e.g., James, 1890; Roberts & Donahue, 1994).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 In the modern era, scholarly interest in personality change is evident in theories that  
36  
37 gained traction in the 1950s and 1960s. Unlike the work of early theorists, such as Freud and  
38  
39 Jung, who emphasized the continuing influence of childhood on adult personality, the writings of  
40  
41 Gordon Allport (1937, 1961), David McClelland (1965), and George Kelly (1955) emphasized  
42  
43 personality change throughout adulthood. This emphasis on personality change contributed to  
44  
45 debates concerning the relative stability of adult personality (e.g., the person-situation debate  
46  
47 initiated by Mischel, 1979), and contributed to the search for evidence of trait heritability (e.g.,  
48  
49 Jang, McCrae, Angleitner, Riemann, & Livesley, 1998). The focus of research moved away from  
50  
51 prior emphases on personality as changeable.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Leaving aside individual abilities such as IQ as unrelated to our current focus on  
4  
5 dispositional rather than ability-based individual differences, and building on the definition of  
6  
7 personality introduced above (Funder, 1997), personality research in organizational behavior can  
8  
9 be organized into three main types of approaches (Roberts & Wood, 2006). The first approach  
10  
11 includes the *traits* that describe people's patterns of thoughts, feelings and behaviors (e.g.,  
12  
13 Funder, 1991); the second includes the *motives and values* that capture people's desires and  
14  
15 needs (e.g., Hogan, 1982; McClelland, 1965; Murray, 1938); and the third refers to *personal*  
16  
17 *constructs, schemas, scripts, and stories* that people develop in order to make sense of and  
18  
19 anticipate experience (e.g., Kelly, 1955; McAdams, 1993).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 ***Traits.*** In looking at the development of trait approaches, it is striking that Gordon  
25  
26 Allport, who is often identified as the progenitor of a list of personality trait terms that helped  
27  
28 form the basis of Big Five research (e.g., Allport & Odbert, 1936), noted that people changed in  
29  
30 response to their social environments. Indeed, in both his early and later writings, he dismissed  
31  
32 the notion of a fixed personality trait: "The ever-changing nature of traits and their close  
33  
34 dependence upon the fluid conditions of the environment forbid a conception that is over-rigid or  
35  
36 over-simple" (Allport, 1937: 312). Allport embraced the notion of personality flexibility: "The  
37  
38 pull of the situation is, however, so powerful that we are forced to regard personality as never a  
39  
40 fixed entity or pattern" (Allport, 1961: 181). Although he claimed that strong situational  
41  
42 pressures might change traits, Allport also suggested that people have an inherent drive toward  
43  
44 psychological growth. He argued that this drive helps account for most personality development  
45  
46 (Allport, 1961). Thus, for Allport, personality development could be said to occur naturally  
47  
48 through a process of inner psychological growth and maturation (Zuroff, 1986). Despite the  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 general emphasis in contemporary personality theory on the fixity of traits, there is now  
4  
5 considerable interest in trait change (e.g., Boyce et al., 2015; Roberts et al., 2008).  
6

7  
8 *Motives, needs, and values.* From the perspective of motives, needs, and values, a  
9  
10 distinctive perspective that recognizes the malleability of human personality specifically in  
11  
12 relation to organizational behavior is acquired needs theory (McClelland, 1965; see Winter,  
13  
14 2011, for a recent empirical test). McClelland emphasized ways in which people who set goals to  
15  
16 strengthen one or more motives could realign their personality system through the practice of  
17  
18 relevant behaviors including workplace activities. (This focus on behavior-induced personality  
19  
20 change has received recent validation – see, for example, Magidson, Roberts, Collado-  
21  
22 Rodriguez, & Lejuez, 2014). Undeterred by prevailing ideas concerning the stability of  
23  
24 personality, McClelland derived inspiration from psychotherapists in developing short (one-to-  
25  
26 three week) courses that enabled many people to change the achievement aspects of their  
27  
28 personalities – aspects important for careers in sales and entrepreneurship (e.g., McClelland,  
29  
30 1987; see Collins, Hanges, & Locke, 2004 for a meta-analysis).  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Perhaps the most influential current approach to personality from a needs perspective is  
37  
38 the emphasis on two primary motivations: the need for status and the need for belonging. People  
39  
40 strive for status, personal achievement, and power but they also strive for social acceptance,  
41  
42 inclusion, and the avoidance of rejection (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hogan, 1996; Hogan &  
43  
44 Holland, 2003; Mitchell, 1997). Status striving and communion striving represent energy  
45  
46 resources (Hobfoll, 1989) that people devote to getting ahead of others and getting along with  
47  
48 others (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007). Status and communion are fundamental motivational  
49  
50 orientations (Wiggins, 1991) of particular relevance for organizational behavior (Stewart &  
51  
52 Barrick, 2004).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           ***Personal constructs, schemas, scripts, and stories.*** Personality approaches that focus on  
4 traits or needs tend to compare across individuals. But such normative approaches often miss the  
5 distinctive idiosyncrasies of individuals. Capturing individual distinctiveness requires more  
6 idiographic approaches such as those offered by researchers who collect people’s life narratives  
7 (e.g., Block & Airasian, 1971; McAdams, 1993) or personal projects (e.g., Little, 1983). We  
8 focus here on George Kelly’s (1955) personal construct approach that is explicit in its  
9 endorsement of personality change at the individual level, but that also offers a generalizable  
10 theory and method for comparing across individual construals. Kelly (1955) offered  
11 organizational behavior researchers (e.g., de Vries, Walter, Van der Vegt, & Essens, 2014; see  
12 Cornelius, 2015, for a review) a personality psychology that emphasizes the principle of  
13 constructive alternativism as a way to understand and potentially change the idiosyncratic  
14 cognitive systems people use to manage problems. According to personal construct theory, each  
15 person evolves through experience in the world a set of schematic templates for anticipating their  
16 own and others’ behaviors. These personal construct systems help frame and simplify events and  
17 allow predictions about what is likely to happen (e.g., Borman, 1987). The principle of  
18 constructive alternativism states that the individual’s current set of interpretations (that form the  
19 basis of the individual’s personality) are always subject to revision or replacement: “No one  
20 needs to paint himself into a corner; no one needs to be completely hemmed in by circumstances;  
21 no one needs to be the victim of his biography” (Kelly, 1955: 15). People can improve their ways  
22 of dealing with the world by learning from their mistakes and thereby revising the basic  
23 constructs through which they view the world and their experiences of it.

24  
25  
26           Personality, from this perspective, does not represent some fundamental essence of the  
27 individual but rather a system of construing by which the individual relates to others – a system

1  
2  
3 that functions much like a set of hypotheses derived from the individual's theory of the self. Of  
4  
5 course, given the importance of this construing system to the individual, attempts at personality  
6  
7 change are likely to face resistance. But Kelly emphasized that personality is alterable, in the  
8  
9 same way that a flawed scientific theory is alterable in the face of failed hypotheses. The  
10  
11 distinctive approach to individuals' personality change embodied in personal construct theory  
12  
13 continues to influence both psychological research (see Walker & Winter, 2007, for a review),  
14  
15 research across the social sciences more generally (see the recent handbook edited by Winter &  
16  
17 Reed, 2015), and decision-making research in organizations (e.g., Eden & Ackermann, 2010).  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Kelly's approach to personality change focused on individualized role therapy during  
23  
24 which clients enacted hypothetical characters in order to derive evidence for how they could  
25  
26 engage in new ways of behaving and thinking. Thus, people were considered active agents in the  
27  
28 construction of their own sense-making personas rather than reactive victims of inherited traits or  
29  
30 environmental demands (see Neimeyer, 1993, for a review). Building on the argument of  
31  
32 personal construct theory that a person's processes are psychologically channeled by the ways in  
33  
34 which he or she anticipates events (Kelly, 1963), recent studies show that people can  
35  
36 constructively change their personality through intensive coaching, self-expression, and  
37  
38 experiential knowledge (e.g., Weiss, Bates, & Luciano, 2008). And constructive personality  
39  
40 change has been widely used in leadership training in industry and in coaching programs during  
41  
42 organizational change (e.g., Reger, Gustafson, Demarie, & Mullane, 1994). Personality theory,  
43  
44 building on Kelly's (1955) emphasis on the importance of understanding cognitive-affective  
45  
46 encodings, expectancies, and beliefs, emphasizes the distinctive nature of individual personality  
47  
48 signatures in the context of situational variability (Mischel & Shoda, 1995).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Thus, several theorists in the post-war era depicted people as active agents who were able  
4 to adapt their personalities in response to challenges and opportunities. This research was based  
5 on a developmental view of personality that emphasized ways in which people could change. But  
6 personality research as a whole tended to rely on assumptions concerning the stability of fixed  
7 traits. In consequence, one of George Kelly's students, Walter Mischel (1968), fired the first  
8 salvo in what came to be known as the person-situation debate when he critiqued the fixed trait  
9 approach to personality as inconsistent with evidence that people's behaviors tended to be  
10 determined by the pressures of different situations. The reaction in personality psychology was to  
11 redouble efforts to find personality stability (e.g., Bem & Allen, 1974; Epstein & O'Brien, 1985).  
12 Thus, one resolution to the person-situation debate is to acknowledge that a person's momentary  
13 behaviors vary widely due to situational pressures, but that a person's average scores on  
14 personality traits over longer stretches of time are "very stable" (Fleeson, 2004: 86). In  
15 organizational behavior, much effort was devoted to providing evidence of stability in people's  
16 dispositions over their working lives (e.g., Bell & Staw, 1989; Staw et al., 1986; Staw & Ross,  
17 1985). The situational side of the argument was quick to assert the importance of job design and  
18 other situational contributors to variability (e.g., Gerhart, 1987), and to attack the resurgence of  
19 personality research as flawed given that organizations represented strong situations in which  
20 dispositional effects could be dismissed as "just a mirage" (Davis-Blake & Pfeffer, 1989).

21  
22 In recent decades, the field of organizational behavior has moved on from this person-  
23 situation debate. While acknowledging the relevance of situational pressures, researchers have  
24 demonstrated the importance of relatively fixed traits in predicting a range of outcomes of  
25 interest to organizational behavior that include performance motivation (see Judge & Ilies, 2002,  
26 for a meta-analysis) and leadership (see Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002, for a meta-  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 analysis). The situation in which the individual is embedded and the personality resources that  
4  
5 the individual brings to bear on the situation are both now recognized as contributing to  
6  
7 outcomes (e.g., Tasselli & Kilduff, 2017). For example, recent research showed that Big Five  
8  
9 personality traits were stronger predictors of job performance for jobs that were weakly  
10  
11 constrained by situational pressures (e.g., jobs that were unstructured, and jobs in which  
12  
13 employees had discretion to make decisions) relative to jobs that were strongly constrained  
14  
15 (Judge & Zapata, 2015). Moving on from the person-situation debate, our aim is to consider the  
16  
17 evidence and implications for an organizational view of personality that incorporates the  
18  
19 neglected developmental and change perspectives. Figure 1 (adapted from the neo-socioanalytic  
20  
21 model of Roberts & Nickel, 2017) represents a summary of antecedents to change, a typology of  
22  
23 personality approaches, and likely outcomes of personality change.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

Insert Figure 1 about here

---

## ANTECEDENTS OF PERSONALITY CHANGE

Personality can change because of self-driven or external processes. We review research of relevance for organizational behavior concerning the antecedents of personality change. Specifically, we introduce and discuss recent research on self-development, organizational events and processes, and external events and processes.

### **Self-Development**

The desire to change personality is widespread, with over 87% of people reporting that they want to change core aspects of the self that include extraversion and conscientiousness (Hudson & Fraley, 2016). People in organizations tend to believe that they can change almost

1  
2  
3 any work-relevant characteristic through effort (Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008). And young adults  
4 self-report changes in industriousness, impulse control, and reliability even though outside  
5  
6 observers fail to notice these changes (Jackson et al., 2009). In changing personality, self-  
7  
8 affirmation interventions, therapy, and self-actualization efforts enable individuals to develop  
9  
10 more expansive views of the self, its relationships with the environment, and its resources (e.g.,  
11  
12 Cohen & Garcia, 2008; Garcia & Cohen, 2013; Hudson & Fraley, 2015; Wilson, 2011; Yeager &  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Walton, 2011).

19 ***Self-affirmation.*** In contrast to the traditional pessimism concerning person-driven change  
20  
21 (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1988), recent studies show that self-affirmation activities, including  
22  
23 writing about core personal values, can help shape individuals' personalities, both encouraging  
24  
25 individuals to appraise life and work threats in a positive, non-defensive way and shaping  
26  
27 people's psychological self-appraisals (e.g., Dweck, 2008; McQueen & Klein, 2006). Through  
28  
29 self-affirmation interventions, individuals reinforce their psychological self-integrity by  
30  
31 manifesting and re-affirming values of importance for them (Garcia & Cohen, 2013; Wilson,  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
2011; Yeager & Walton, 2011). Changing personality, in these instances, relates to the ways in  
which people construe themselves and the psychological resources they have available to deal  
with challenges to their identities. Practices such as writing about core values can permanently  
change how people filter information about themselves and their environments (see Cohen &  
Sherman, 2014, for a review).

Individuals can achieve change as they become self-affirmed and as others in the work  
environment affirm their new selves through positive feedback. Self-help, support groups,  
personal growth, and self-affirmation facilitate positive change in individual personality (e.g.,  
Walker & Winter, 2007). For people suffering from personality disorders related to depression

1  
2  
3 and anxiety (emotions often experienced in the workplace – e.g., Kouchaki & Desai, 2015;  
4 Priesemuth & Taylor, 2016), guided self-help is effective in fostering positive change (see  
5 Cuijpers, Donker, van Straten, Li, & Andersson, 2010, for a meta-analysis). And as people move  
6 into new roles in organizations, they experiment with provisional selves that serve as trials for  
7 possible but not yet fully elaborated professional identities (Ibarra, 1999) that can incorporate  
8 personality traits activated by the new work contexts (e.g., Judge & Zapata, 2015).  
9

10  
11  
12 In reviewing self-affirmation interventions and related approaches, it is worth noting that  
13 the prior advocates of personality change possibility were psychologists pursuing (non-Freudian)  
14 therapeutic approaches, particularly those associated with humanistic psychology, such as  
15 personal construct theory (Kelly, 1955), discussed above. A related modern-day approach is  
16 behavior activation (BA) therapy, in which individuals rate daily work activities on levels of  
17 importance and enjoyment, and then prepare a structured plan for engaging in activities  
18 consistent with their self-assessed important values (Farmer & Chapman, 2016). Through  
19 increased engagement in activities that are considered important, enjoyable, and in accordance  
20 with individual values across numerous work and life-related domains, people can register  
21 increases in traits, such as conscientiousness, that relate to valued work outcomes (Magidson et  
22 al., 2014).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 ***State or trait change?*** As extensive evidence has accumulated over the last decades on the  
43 possibility of personality change following individuals' self-development interventions (Rogers,  
44 2007), two opposing perspectives have emerged concerning whether such personality changes  
45 capture *state* or *trait* variance. The first position argues that changes in personality observed  
46 during therapy are attributable to (relatively transient) state-level variance rather than (relatively  
47 enduring) trait-level variance (e.g., Du, Bakish, Ravindran, & Hrdina, 2002). From this  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 perspective, trait measures are imperfect constructs that capture both trait and state change. The  
4  
5 second position claims that the changes observed during interventions may capture variation in  
6  
7 the trait itself, and not in the state component of the personality construct (e.g., Soskin, Carl,  
8  
9 Alpert, & Fava, 2012). According to this second perspective, interventions enable enduring  
10  
11 improvement to individuals' psychological disorders, and have real consequences for people's  
12  
13 personal and work-related outcomes.  
14  
15

16  
17 A recent meta-analysis (Roberts, Luo, Briley, Chow, Su, & Hill, 2017) showed that  
18  
19 personality changes following interventions involved trait (rather than state) variation. There was  
20  
21 no evidence that the effects of interventions faded over time. Rather, the effects of interventions  
22  
23 appeared to permanently affect people's personalities. The largest effect of such interventions on  
24  
25 personality was observed for emotional stability and extraversion, whereas other traits, including  
26  
27 openness to experience, did not evidence significant variation over time. Of note is that all forms  
28  
29 of interventions (behavioral therapy, cognitive therapy, and psychodynamic interventions), with  
30  
31 the exception of hospitalization, reported the same effects on personality change. These results  
32  
33 concerning improvements in personality development are important given that, for example,  
34  
35 people who exhibit stability or decreases in neuroticism over a period of 12 years have higher  
36  
37 survival rates than people who exhibit increases in neuroticism over the same time interval  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 (Mroczek & Spiro, 2007).  
43

44  
45 Change efforts can be facilitated by relatively short-term interventions (e.g., Magidson et  
46  
47 al., 2014; Smith, Glass, & Miller, 1980) in contrast to the lifelong therapy advocated by  
48  
49 Freudians and Jungians. For example, a 20-week cognitive-behavioral therapy intervention  
50  
51 helped increase extraversion and decrease neuroticism (Clark et al., 2003). Therapies lasting four  
52  
53 or more weeks achieved half the amount of change in personality traits that people usually  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 display in their life course from young adulthood through middle age (half a standard deviation)  
4  
5 (Roberts et al., 2017). Thus, a therapeutic endeavor to develop the work skills of those suffering  
6  
7 drug dependencies involved clients in a six-week, five-days-a-week, six-hours-a-day program of  
8  
9 vocational skill training and therapeutic engagement. The program succeeded in effecting  
10  
11 positive change in personality traits of neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. These  
12  
13 changes were independent of symptom experience, demonstrating that shifts in adaptive  
14  
15 orientation were not merely reflections of symptomatic relief: changes in personality scores were  
16  
17 not acting simply as markers of shifts in state-level functioning. Instead, there was evidence of  
18  
19 significant change in underlying traits (Piedmont, 2001).  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The evidence suggests that people can change their personalities through processes that  
25  
26 include personal striving, therapeutic engagement, active coaching, and reflective engagement  
27  
28 with experiences at work. The positive message concerning personality change challenges the  
29  
30 emphasis from much organizational psychology on the stability of individuals' dispositions over  
31  
32 large chunks of their working life (e.g., Staw et al., 1986). People, of course, differ in the extent  
33  
34 to which they have the motivation and ability to change their personalities, but these differences  
35  
36 in the likelihood of personality change have been neglected in personality research (Mroczek,  
37  
38 Almeida, Spiro, & Pafford, 2006).  
39  
40  
41

42 ***Self-actualization.*** These emphases on guided self-improvement and therapy toward a  
43  
44 better, if not optimal, personality system have been taken up by researchers associated with the  
45  
46 positive psychology movement, with a focus on how people can effect change toward sustainable  
47  
48 happiness and well-being (Snyder & Lopez, 2009). The emphasis in positive psychology is on  
49  
50 the individual's self-actualization toward optimal well-being as exhibited in positive subjective  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 experiences, positive personality traits, and the enactment of civic virtues (Seligman &  
4  
5 Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).  
6

7  
8 In advocating the possibility of change toward better functioning, the positive psychology  
9  
10 perspective challenges the prevailing emphasis (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1994) on the relative  
11  
12 stability of the Big Five personality factors. It also challenges the influential hedonic treadmill  
13  
14 idea (e.g., Brickman & Campbell, 1971) that the individual is likely to experience mild-to-  
15  
16 moderate happiness fluctuations around a set point that stays relatively fixed. The positive  
17  
18 psychology emphasis on optimizing human happiness through personality change is related to  
19  
20 prior therapeutic theories and research in the domain of humanistic and constructivist psychology  
21  
22 (e.g., Maslow, 1968) that similarly emphasized individuals' potential for radical change  
23  
24 (Mahoney, 2002; Robbins, 2008). Positive psychology suggests people can effect permanent  
25  
26 personality change through a set of behaviors that include: regular exercise, regular kindness to  
27  
28 others, striving for important personal goals, effort toward meaningful causes, positive reframing  
29  
30 of situations, reflections on one's own blessings, and the practice of classical virtues such as  
31  
32 gratitude, hope, and forgiveness (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005). In moving people  
33  
34 toward greater happiness and well-being, these behaviors also decrease neuroticism and increase  
35  
36 extraversion.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 The theoretical framing of this positive psychology approach to personality change  
43  
44 emphasizes a bottom-up process: Moment-to-moment fluctuations in personality can be targeted  
45  
46 so that underlying traits themselves are gradually changed (Roberts et al., 2006). Healthy  
47  
48 patterns of behavior are practiced until they become habitual. The repeated enactments of these  
49  
50 positive behaviors then manifest themselves in trait-level change (Chapman, Hampson, &  
51  
52 Clarkin, 2014). This bottom-up process of personality change is particularly evident in the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 workplace, given the prevalence of work experiences in shaping how individuals think, feel, and  
4  
5 behave (Wu, 2016). Indeed, research evidence is accumulating concerning how individuals can  
6  
7 increase their positive affectivity and reduce negative traits (Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014).  
8  
9  
10 This evidence suggests that the repeated experience of frequent positive affect generates success  
11  
12 across many different areas of individuals' lives (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). People  
13  
14 who change their personalities in ways that align with their goals experience increases in well-  
15  
16 being over time (Hudson & Fraley, 2016).  
17  
18

19           Thus, a major contribution of the positive psychology movement has been to  
20  
21 counterbalance the emphasis on fixity of personality. According to positive psychology, the  
22  
23 personality trait of positive affectivity is not highly constrained by either objective life conditions  
24  
25 or genetic and biological factors. People are relatively free to increase their positive affectivity  
26  
27 and to move closer toward their potential maximum (Watson, 2002).  
28  
29

30  
31           The focus of positive psychology tends to be on doing rather than thinking or talking as a  
32  
33 way to enact personality change (e.g., Watson, 2002). This emphasis on acting positively to  
34  
35 achieve improvement has been criticized for offering simplistic answers to age-old questions  
36  
37 concerning how to achieve happiness (Gable & Haidt, 2005; Miller, 2008). But the positive  
38  
39 psychology tent incorporates both action-oriented and cognitive-oriented research-based  
40  
41 interventions. The cognitively oriented positive psychology researchers tend to be restrained in  
42  
43 their claims concerning the magnitude of likely personality change. Can pessimists become  
44  
45 optimists through change to the traits of neuroticism and extraversion? The answer, according to  
46  
47 cognitive researchers, comes down to whether cognitive-behavioral therapies and efficacy  
48  
49 training in problem-solving can effect permanent changes that result in behavior identical to that  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 occurring among those natural optimists who are fortunate not to have to strive for such  
4  
5 fundamental change (Carver & Scheier, 2002).  
6

7  
8 Inspired by positive psychology ideas, the positive organizational behavior movement has  
9  
10 emerged in the organizational research landscape and emphasizes the ways in which people  
11  
12 within organizations can increase a range of outcomes, including confidence, self-efficacy, hope,  
13  
14 optimism, subjective well-being, happiness, emotional intelligence, and resilience (e.g., Luthans,  
15  
16 2002; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). New research in this domain investigates the ways people can  
17  
18 flourish in the workplace via the positive work relationships they experience with colleagues and  
19  
20 managers (e.g., Colbert, Bono, & Purvanova, 2016).  
21  
22

### 23 **Organizational Events and Processes**

24  
25  
26 As suggested in Figure 1, personality change can also be triggered by organizational events  
27  
28 and processes, including employment, organizational pressures, and interpersonal relationships  
29  
30 with coworkers.  
31

32  
33 ***Employment and career development.*** Working is crucial to the identity and well-being of  
34  
35 many people. Indeed, a two-year study of young people (aged 17-24 at the start of the study)  
36  
37 showed that youth unemployment was associated with an increased risk of negative outcomes  
38  
39 including personality dysfunction (Thern, de Munter, Hemmingsson, & Rasmussen, 2017). After  
40  
41 starting their first job, individuals tend to increase strongly in conscientiousness (Specht, Egloff,  
42  
43 & Schmukle, 2011) whereas people who become unemployed tend to experience decreases in  
44  
45 agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience (Boyce et al., 2015), and internal locus  
46  
47 of control (Niess, 2014). Overall, unemployment is associated with a significant drop in life  
48  
49 satisfaction (Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, & Diener, 2004). Similarly, people who retire decrease  
50  
51 strongly in conscientiousness (Specht et al., 2011).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 By contrast, people who increase their participation in the paid labor force and those who  
4 become more successful between the ages of 27 and 43 tend to become more assertive in their  
5 personalities (Roberts, 1997). There is, apparently, a surprising plasticity in individuals'  
6 personalities beyond the age of supposedly fixed dispositions. Work environments significantly  
7 influence patterns of personality change through processes that include occupational  
8 socialization (e.g., Stoll & Trautwein, 2017; Wille & De Fruyt, 2014). Other research has shown  
9 that work experiences for young adults (aged between 18 and 26) are predictive of changes in  
10 basic personality traits, although the evidence suggests co-development of personality and work  
11 experience rather than a simple causal effect (Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003). The results show  
12 the beneficial effects for young adults of gaining high-status jobs in terms of changing their  
13 personality toward lower scores on negative dimensions such as aggression, alienation, and  
14 stress, and toward higher scores on positive dimensions such as social closeness and well-being.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Considering the increasing emphasis in the modern business environment on the  
32 internationalization of work activities, it is notable that the personal jolt of experiencing even a  
33 temporary international work assignment affects personality. Early research on language and  
34 personality showed that the individual feels and behaves "like a different person" when speaking  
35 a second language (Guiora & Acton, 1979). Both short-term and long-term international mobility  
36 change individuals' personalities (beyond self-selection explanations) toward greater openness to  
37 experience, agreeableness, and emotional stability (Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 ***Organizational pressures.*** The constraints and stress that people experience within  
48 organizations can change personality, both for the better and the worse. For example, the severe  
49 psychological trauma that results from internment in a concentration camp induced depressive  
50 personality structures irrespective of pre-traumatic event life experiences (Fink, 2003). More  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 generally, individuals facing temporary denial of individual freedom (such as imprisonment) are  
4 likely to develop antisocial personality problems (Lamb & Weinberger, 1998). Organizations  
5 (such as asylums, prisons, and the military) that impose total control on individual expression  
6 and freedom can strip away the sense of self, resulting in changes to personality traits and  
7 functions (Goffman, 1961). And people who experience wrongful criminal convictions tend to  
8 exhibit "enduring personality change" including anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder  
9 (Grounds, 2004).

19 Classic psychological research emphasized the positive effects of military training,  
20 suggesting that enrolment in the army matures young individuals and contributes to an  
21 improvement in socialization skills (James, 1910/1988). But more recent research challenged this  
22 positive view in investigating the complex patterns of personality change associated with a total  
23 organizational experience such as the military service. A study using a large longitudinal sample  
24 of German males showed that, in a two-year period, military recruits manifested a drop in their  
25 mean levels of agreeableness that persisted for five years even as they re-entered civilian life.  
26 Thus, extreme organizational pressures can entail long-lasting influences on personality  
27 (Jackson, Thoemmes, Jonkmann, Lüdtkke, & Trautwein, 2012; but see Schult & Sparfeldt, 2015,  
28 for a contrasting perspective).

42 It is worthy of note that organizational roles that appear attractive and well-remunerated  
43 can leave a hidden legacy of psychological damage including personality deterioration. Players  
44 in the National Football League who experience concussions on the field of play are liable to a  
45 lifetime of depression (Didehbani, Cullum, Mansinghani, Conover, & Hart, 2013). These routine  
46 head injuries do more than cause physical trauma – the effects on individuals' personality are  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 also detrimental: self-reliance and increased irritability are evident to relatives within three  
4  
5 months (Brooks & McKinlay, 1983).  
6

7  
8       Organizational contexts can also change personality for the better. For example, as people  
9  
10 move into more complex jobs, they tend to become more flexible, whereas moves into more  
11  
12 autonomous jobs lead people to be more self-evaluative (Kohn & Schooler, 1978) and more  
13  
14 competent (Mortimer & Lorence, 1979). Employees whose jobs require a variety of skills tend to  
15  
16 experience higher well-being (Roberts et al., 2003), greater emotional stability (Brousseau &  
17  
18 Prince, 1981), and increased social dominance (Brousseau & Prince, 1981). More generally,  
19  
20 work autonomy tends to increase young adults' psychological well-being and positive  
21  
22 emotionality (Roberts et al., 2003). Interestingly, work autonomy is also associated with an  
23  
24 increase in young adults' psychological alienation (Roberts et al., 2003), suggesting that the rise  
25  
26 in personal independence in modern work environments might hamper the quality of  
27  
28 interpersonal interactions with coworkers. In contrast, stimulating work is associated with  
29  
30 individuals experiencing higher well-being and higher psychological achievement (Roberts et al.,  
31  
32 2003). A three-year longitudinal analysis showed that individuals stimulated by both higher job  
33  
34 demands and job control were more likely to increase their proactive personality compared to  
35  
36 people with less task control at work (Li, Barrick, Zimmerman, & Chiaburu, 2014).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42       Thus, people look to organizational contexts for possibilities for personality renewal and  
43  
44 affirmation (e.g., Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy, & Quinn, 2005). But people who select  
45  
46 themselves into stressful work roles may experience unwelcome increases in neuroticism and  
47  
48 decreases in extraversion (Wu, 2016). The inference is that high-status jobs and occupations are  
49  
50 effective in promoting beneficial personality change, whereas stressful work roles can lead to  
51  
52 unwanted personality change that depletes well-being. In general, if people in the workplace  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 strive for daily shifts in thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, then they can expect these persistent  
4  
5 state-level changes to eventually coalesce into changes in basic personality traits (Hudson &  
6  
7 Fraley, 2016).  
8  
9

10 ***Relationships with coworkers.*** The interpersonal context of work also contributes to  
11  
12 personality change. Thus, the extent to which individuals experience relationships with  
13  
14 coworkers as satisfactory relates to increased extraversion and decreased neuroticism (Scollon &  
15  
16 Diener, 2006). Students who perceive a better personal fit with the college environment and with  
17  
18 their classmates are more likely to become open to experience and to gain higher academic  
19  
20 achievements (Harms, Roberts, & Winter, 2006). Individuals who increase their social  
21  
22 investment in work activities with coworkers tend to become more conscientious and more  
23  
24 agreeable, whereas people who de-invest in the social aspects of their work activities decrease in  
25  
26 conscientiousness over time. Furthermore, people who increase their counterproductive  
27  
28 behaviors toward colleagues (for example, making fun of people at work) also become less  
29  
30 extraverted and less emotionally stable (Hudson & Roberts, 2016).  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Well-known research suggests that distinctive collegial contexts of organizations result  
36  
37 from processes of attraction, selection, and retention of individuals who are similar in their  
38  
39 personalities (e.g., Schneider et al., 1998). But evidence also suggests that contexts can grow  
40  
41 more similar over time as people's personalities converge through contact with other people. In  
42  
43 the workplace, common negative behaviors such as rudeness can spread as easily as the common  
44  
45 cold with significant consequences for coworkers, including negative affect (Foulk, Woolum, &  
46  
47 Erez, 2016). And leader charisma can result via emotional contagion in followers imitating  
48  
49 leaders' non-verbal behaviors, thereby enhancing the expression of followers' own charisma  
50  
51 (Cherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, & Miller, 2001). Beyond this, longitudinal research in the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sociology of medicine shows widespread evidence of contagion among friends and friends of  
4  
5 friends of loneliness, happiness, and depression that are related to the personality traits of  
6  
7 neuroticism, positive affect, and negative affect (Cacioppo, Fowler, & Christakis, 2009; Fowler  
8  
9 & Christakis, 2008; Rosenquist, Fowler, & Christakis, 2011). Personality change may be  
10  
11  
12 speeded by the daily workplace encounters with others different from one's self.  
13

### 14 **External Events and Processes**

15  
16  
17 Personality can change through individual desire, training, and agency, and through  
18  
19 events and processes within work organizations. But work-related personality can also be shaped  
20  
21 over time by the process of aging, as well as by individuals' experience of events that affect job  
22  
23 experiences and careers. The Big Five, for example, can change following changes in  
24  
25 interpersonal relationships (e.g., marriage), the death of a close person in the family (e.g., death  
26  
27 of a parent), and changes in the composition of a family (e.g., birth of a child) (Roberts et al.,  
28  
29 2006; Specht et al., 2011). Disruptive personal experiences such as alcohol abuse (e.g., Hicks,  
30  
31 Durbin, Blonigen, Iacono, & McGue, 2012; Littlefield, Sher, & Wood, 2009) and personal  
32  
33 trauma (e.g., Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014) contribute to changes in personality and have  
34  
35 spillover effects in the workplace. Immigration, war, and other traumatic events can change  
36  
37 personality too (Stewart & Deaux, 2012). The appearance of relatively unchanging personality  
38  
39 may depend on the consistency of situations to which the individual is exposed (Mischel, 1973;  
40  
41 Roberts & Wood, 2006). In this review, we focus on the effects on personality change of  
42  
43 domestic jolts, education, and the aging process.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 ***Domestic jolts.*** People experience changes in their lives due to domestic influences that  
50  
51 may be invisible to work colleagues but that affect their personalities inside the workplace. Thus,  
52  
53 a study over four years of nearly 15,000 people (mean age at start of study = 47) showed that  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 women who moved out of their parents' home (relative to women who remained) became more  
4 emotionally stable (although there was no effect for men – Specht et al., 2011). A six-year study  
5 of over 4,000 young adults (mean age at start of the research = 19.6) showed that living with a  
6 partner (rather than by oneself or with one's parents) was associated with development in self-  
7 esteem (Wagner, Lüdtké, Jonkmann, & Trautwein, 2013). An eight-year study of over 300 young  
8 adults (mean age at start of study = 24) showed that the transition to living with a partner also led  
9 to decreases in neuroticism and increases in extraversion (Neyer & Lehnart, 2007). And  
10 individuals who continued to cohabit with a partner tended to exhibit decreases in neuroticism  
11 and increases in agreeableness compared to those who ended these relationships (Lehnart &  
12 Neyer, 2006). Self-ratings show that in the two years after getting married people become more  
13 agreeable, more conscientious, and less neurotic (Watson & Humrichouse, 2006).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Childbearing is also associated with personality dynamics. A nine-year study of over 1,500  
29 people of child-bearing age showed that the birth of a child tended to increase parents'  
30 emotionality, particularly for people with high baseline emotionality who already had two or  
31 more children. For men, having a child enhanced sociability, but only for men with high baseline  
32 sociability to begin with; for those with low baseline sociability, the arrival of a child decreased  
33 sociability (Jokela, Kivimäki, Elovainio, & Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Overall, therefore, these domestic changes in people's lives can change personality traits  
43 such as conscientiousness and extraversion that have significant implications for people's  
44 success in organizational careers.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 **Education.** The importance of educational paths and other formative activities has  
50 attracted the longstanding attention of organizational researchers (e.g., Judge, Cable, Boudreau,  
51 & Bretz, 1995). But only recently has research investigated whether education affects  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 personality-related skills, competences, and goals (e.g., Bandura, 1999). Students who attend  
4 class and spend more time on their homework than their peers tend to increase more in  
5 conscientiousness; similarly, students who experience fewer stressful experiences during their  
6 educational years are more likely to decrease in neuroticism (Jackson, 2011).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12       Some of the changes associated with education represent unanticipated consequences of  
13 personal choices. Specifically, college students who choose vocational specializations at  
14 university, as well as young professionals who choose vocational training at work, are more  
15 likely to exhibit increases in conscientiousness and agreeableness than their less vocationally-  
16 minded peers over a four-year interval (Lüdtke, Roberts, Trautwein, & Nagy, 2011). The  
17 important question remains as to whether personality change results from inherent latent traits  
18 that lead students to choose a particular educational trajectory or whether the educational training  
19 itself, through knowledge and social skill acquisition, shapes personality.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30       ***Aging.*** From the very beginnings of psychology, leading voices proclaimed personality  
31 changes over the life course to be unlikely if not impossible. According to some influential  
32 researchers, the individual's personality is largely stable by the age of 30 (e.g., Costa & McCrae,  
33 1998; James, 1890). Others have claimed that personality is fixed much earlier – by adolescence  
34 (Bloom, 1964), or even by the age of two or three because of child-rearing practices (e.g., Sapir,  
35 1934), or fully developed in terms of the ego, the id, and the superego by the age of five (e.g.,  
36 Freud, 1923). In keeping with this traditional unwillingness to acknowledge the possibility of  
37 personality change over the life course, more recent theorists and empiricists have reiterated the  
38 mantra that the individual's personality is stable over time. Personality stability, we have been  
39 told, derives from the potency of inherited predispositions (e.g., Johnson, McGue, & Krueger,  
40 2005; Lykken & Tellegen, 1996) or because of the influences of both genetics and environmental  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shaping (e.g., Cloninger, 1986). A weaker version of the stability argument is that personality  
4 change can happen later in life, but the probability of change decreases with age (Glenn, 1980).  
5  
6

7  
8 Recent results challenge this stability perspective, showing that people experience  
9  
10 substantial change in personality as a result of aging: Individuals tend to become more  
11 conscientious, more extraverted, and less neurotic over time (Roberts et al., 2006). Most  
12  
13 personality change occurs between the ages of 20 and 40 (an important period in many adults'  
14  
15 working lives), but people keep changing into middle and old age (Edmonds, Jackson, Fayard, &  
16  
17 Roberts, 2008; Roberts & Mroczek, 2008). Older people, in particular, tend to exhibit increases  
18  
19 in agreeableness and decreases in openness to experience and social vitality compared to the  
20  
21 young and middle aged (Roberts et al., 2006). Moreover, conscientiousness and agreeableness  
22  
23 continue to increase throughout early and middle adulthood at varying rates, whereas  
24  
25 neuroticism tends to decline among women but not among men (Srivastava, John, Gosling, &  
26  
27 Potter, 2003). The cumulative amount of change of such trait domains across the life course  
28  
29 exceeds one full standard deviation (Roberts & Mroczek, 2008).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Cohort studies examine longitudinal change in personality by following the same group of  
36  
37 individuals over time. A recent study of a Scottish cohort over a 63-year time interval (first  
38  
39 assessment of personality at age 14 and second assessment at age 77) showed that the lifelong  
40  
41 stability of personality was quite low, but that some aspects of personality in older age did relate  
42  
43 to personality in childhood (Harris, Brett, Johnson, & Deary, 2016). A study following a cohort  
44  
45 of Hawaiians over a 40-year time interval found no to little evidence for stability in neuroticism  
46  
47 and agreeableness, and modest to moderate evidence for stability in openness to experience,  
48  
49 conscientiousness, and extraversion (Hampson & Goldberg, 2006). Similarly, a longitudinal  
50  
51 study tracking Harvard graduates over a 45-year time interval found modest correlations between  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the two time intervals for neuroticism and extraversion, and a moderate correlation for openness  
4 to experience (Soldz & Vaillant, 1999).  
5  
6

7  
8 Accidents, addictions, and other traumatic life events can accelerate the negative effects of  
9 aging on personality in ways that alter career possibilities. Despite the strong norms that separate  
10 home life and work life, recent research has argued that “organizations need to understand,  
11 acknowledge, and address the emotional upheaval, stress, and fear that their employees may  
12 experience as a consequence of events and crises outside the workplace” (Ragins, Lyness,  
13 Williams, & Winkel, 2014: 765). For example, significant proportions of working adults engage  
14 in excessive alcohol consumption (e.g., Cahalan, Cisin, & Crossley, 1969) and are employed  
15 until the middle or late stages of their disorder (Trice, 1962). This is a workplace problem to the  
16 extent that it affects performance and relationships in the workplace. Because of the spillover  
17 effects of addiction, there is widespread provision of employer-funded intervention programs  
18 (Webb, Skakeshaft, Sanson-Fisher, & Havard, 2009). Alcohol addiction affects not just the  
19 physical health of employees, it also damages work-related personality traits leading to increases  
20 in neuroticism, impulsivity (Littlefield et al., 2009), and other personality dysfunctions (Hicks et  
21 al., 2012).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Physical activity (on or off the job) helps prevent such maladaptive psychological changes  
41 in adulthood and old age. More physically active individuals exhibit less decrease in  
42 extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability as they age. Moreover,  
43 these individuals are also more likely to maintain psychological consistency over time (Stephan,  
44 Sutin, & Terracciano, 2014, 2015).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Several trends emerge from these studies of age-related personality change and stability.  
52 Of note is the tendency for people to retain personality changes that occurred due to aging  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 instead of returning to their earlier selves. There appears to be no biological set point where  
4  
5 people change but then revert to earlier trait levels (Roberts & Mroczek, 2008). Second,  
6  
7 psychological functioning is not fixed at a certain age: Individuals retain the possibility of  
8  
9 personality change throughout the life course, including middle and old age, challenging the  
10  
11 assumption that personality is set “like plaster” by the age of 30 (James, 1890). Moreover, when  
12  
13 people’s personalities change due to aging (in the absence of problems related to trauma and  
14  
15 addiction), these changes tend to be for the better. Compared to when they were young,  
16  
17 individuals in their middle or old age tend to become more emotionally stable, agreeable, and  
18  
19 self-confident, showing an overall increase in social maturity (Roberts & Mroczek, 2008).  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **OUTCOMES OF PERSONALITY CHANGE**

24  
25  
26 The current research literature suggests that personalities can and do change through  
27  
28 processes and events that include self-development efforts (Hudson & Fraley, 2017), experiences  
29  
30 within organizations, and processes outside of the workplace (as summarized in the left part of  
31  
32 Figure 1). As people’s personalities change, there are likely to be changes in organizationally  
33  
34 relevant outcomes, including how they construct themselves in terms of career choices, job roles,  
35  
36 competencies, and other outcomes that we consider under the broad rubric of work-related  
37  
38 identity. Personality change is also likely to shift how people are evaluated by others in their  
39  
40 organizations in terms of their performance at work, their citizenship contributions, and their  
41  
42 potential as leaders – outcomes that we consider under the broad rubric of work-related  
43  
44 reputation. We highlight the possibilities of identity and reputation change (as summarized in the  
45  
46 right part of Figure 1) but, due to the paucity of studies within organizational behavior, the aim  
47  
48 of this brief and somewhat speculative section is to promote further research on how personality  
49  
50 change affects identity and reputational outcomes.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Identity Change

Personality change can have profound effects on workplace identity, which represents the way in which people define themselves in the context of organizational life (e.g., Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006). As personality changes, people are likely to change how they filter information about themselves and their environments (Cohen & Sherman, 2014), thus leading them to see themselves differently. For example, people are likely to update their interaction strategies so that they seek out and interact with those who validate and reinforce their new, most current self-perceptions (e.g., Ibarra, 1999), given that people prefer to interact with those who see them as they see themselves (Swann & Read, 1981).

Personality change at work is, therefore, likely to affect identity through the social network roles that people enact in organizations; but personality change also relates to formal work roles. As people become more or less extraverted, conscientious, and agreeable, these changes are likely to facilitate transitions into new work roles with consequences for changes to work identities (e.g., Hall, 1995). People who become absorbed in new work roles undergo identity change (e.g., West, Nicholson, & Arnold, 1987).

Influential research also suggests that personality change affects individuals' identities in terms of their career preferences (e.g., Roberts et al., 2003). For example, changes in extraversion are related to the extent to which people experience changes in "presenter" career roles at work – these require individuals to shape ideas, images, or products in ways that make them more attractive and convincing (Wille, Beyers, & De Fruyt, 2012). Increases in emotional stability result in individuals seeking out more secure and predictable work environments, just as increases in openness to experience result in individuals avoiding inflexible, conforming work environments (e.g., Wille & De Fruyt, 2014).



1  
2  
3 Overall, therefore, people who experience personality change are likely to have different  
4 experiences with which to construct their identities at work (e.g., Dickie, 2003). Work becomes  
5 meaningful to the individual when the individual's preferred self finds expression in work roles  
6 and in organizational membership (Kahn, 1990). Professionals and others who experience  
7 mismatch between their current identities and their work roles are likely to engage in identity  
8 customization processes, including deepening their work identities, creating new composite  
9 identities, and reverting to prior identities as temporary exigencies to manage role pressures  
10 (Pratt et al., 2006).

### 21 **Reputation Change**

22  
23  
24 As personality change affects identity change, and as people consequently enact different  
25 behaviors over time, people's reputations in the eyes of others are also likely to change. By  
26 reputation we refer to how others regard individuals on the basis of their past activities  
27 (including performance) at work (e.g., Ertug & Castellucci, 2013). Personality change is likely to  
28 affect important reputation outcomes such as the ability to adapt to changing work circumstances  
29 (Huang, Ryan, Zabel, & Palmer, 2014). The Big Five personality traits are well-known  
30 predictors of work performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991), so individuals who exhibit  
31 change on these indicators are likely to exhibit change in how their contributions are perceived in  
32 the workplace. And, to the extent that individuals become more or less extraverted, agreeable,  
33 open, conscientious, and emotionally stable, they are likely to be seen differently by others as  
34 their interactions in the workplace undergo transformation (e.g., Ibarra, 1999).

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Personality affects who seeks advice from whom, who becomes friends with whom, and even the people one names as a work partner (Fang, Landis, Zhang, Anderson, Shaw, & Kilduff, 2015; Tasselli, Kilduff, & Menges, 2015). Thus, changes to individuals' personalities are likely

1  
2  
3 to change individuals' patterns of social connections. To the extent that people are known by the  
4 company they keep (e.g., Kilduff, Crossland, Tsai, & Bowers, 2016), changes to interaction  
5 patterns mean changes to reputation in terms of how people are perceived by others. Network  
6 connections are prisms through which other people attempt to discern the individual's inner  
7 qualities, including performance potential (Podolny, 2001) and potential for conflicts in their  
8 relationships (e.g., Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995).  
9

10  
11 The effects of personality change on reputation outcomes may generalize to whole  
12 cohorts of people entering employment at the same time and moving through socialization  
13 experiences. (For a review of cohort differences in personality, see Hülür, 2017). Personality  
14 effects are shaped by the time periods in which people live. Thus, in China, shyness went from  
15 being a desirable trait in traditional Chinese society to being an undesirable trait in the market  
16 economy era, with changing reputational consequences: Whereas in the earlier period shyness  
17 predicted leadership and achievement, in the market era, shyness predicted peer disregard and  
18 loneliness (Liu, Chen, Li, & French, 2012).  
19

20  
21 Personality differences affect many reputational outcomes such as job performance (e.g.,  
22 Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hogan & Holland, 2003), leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge et al.,  
23 2002a), satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002b), citizenship behaviors (Borman, Penner,  
24 Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995), and counterproductive work behaviors (Berry,  
25 Ones, & Sackett, 2007). The big gap in our understanding concerns how personality *change*  
26 affects these reputational outcomes. The right-hand side of Figure 1 offers the most opportunities  
27 for new research activities. Beyond this general observation, we offer below more specifics on  
28 some new directions for research on personality change in organizations.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## NEW DIRECTIONS FOR PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

The growing evidence concerning personality change offers a rich set of opportunities for organizational behavior researchers to build on and challenge existing work. We envisage a shift away from personality traits as "uncovered factors which we formulate in terms of static explanatory contents" (Gendlin, 1964) toward more dynamic approaches involving personal flexibility and change. In this section, we explore whether and how a dynamic perspective on personality can contribute to reconsidering our understanding of central topics in organizational behavior research, including leadership emergence and leaders' behavior, personality-job fit, task design, and personnel selection. We suggest that this view of personality as changing over time can help broaden and deepen the scope of theory and measurement of personality in organizational research.

### **Reconsidering Central Topics in Organizational Behavior Research**

*Leadership.* There is growing interest in issues of authenticity in organizational life (e.g., Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011) focused on individuals behaving in ways that reflect inner and self-transcendent values (Detert & Bruno, 2017). For example, authentic leaders manage values such as honesty, loyalty and equality in their interaction with followers to gain relational authenticity (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). From this perspective, leaders draw from personality resources to foster self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors towards their followers (Luthans & Avolio, 2003: 243).

But the literature on individual leadership adaptability suggests that situational pressures, and the leaders' ability to change their behavior in different social situations, are important determinants of leaders' success (Blume, Baldwin, & Ryan, 2013). There is emerging interest in

1  
2  
3 the attributes of leaders related to behavioral adaption and change (Zaccaro, 2007: 9). Such  
4  
5 attributes can include emotional intelligence, cognitive skills, and flexibility. And leadership  
6  
7 research investigates whether latent leadership traits, including charisma, are socially discovered  
8  
9 and manifested in given social situations. For example, a recent study reinterpreting charismatic  
10  
11 leadership from a network personality perspective analyzed whether leaders who occupied  
12  
13 positions of centrality in team advice networks exhibited emergent charisma over time or  
14  
15 whether charismatic leaders went on to occupy central network positions (Balkundi et al., 2011).  
16  
17 Results showed that leaders' centrality preceded the emergence of leader charisma. There is also  
18  
19 growing interest in understanding whether and how charisma can spread from leaders to  
20  
21 followers in organizational settings: Followers tend to imitate charismatic leaders' non-verbal  
22  
23 behavior, enhancing in turn the expression of their personal charisma (Cherulnik et al., 2001).  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 The growing evidence that personality can change over time triggers future research  
30  
31 opportunities concerning whether people can develop leader-relevant personalities through the  
32  
33 occupation of organizational roles, and whether successful leaders' personalities may change if  
34  
35 confronted with specific social situations.  
36  
37

38 ***Personality-job fit.*** According to existing approaches to personality-job fit, people with  
39  
40 specific attributes and traits are considered suitable to occupy specific roles in organizations  
41  
42 (e.g., Judge et al., 2002b). In contrast, sociologists suggest that actors' occupation of positions in  
43  
44 social and organizational systems elicit specific role behaviors. In this sense, social structures  
45  
46 and processes "vastly transcend the individual consciousness of actors" (Lorrain & White, 1971:  
47  
48 50). Personality, from a sociological view, is a set of characteristics granted by others. Each  
49  
50 person develops a social personality that derives from occupation of "a particular place in the  
51  
52 social space of a given society" (Warner & Lunt, 1941: 26). Recent research in this domain  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 claims that the position occupied in organizational networks (e.g., a brokerage position spanning  
4 across gaps in social structure) is an indicator itself of social personality to the extent that actors  
5 display consistency in in the network positions they occupy (Burt, 2012). Future research can  
6 examine the extent to which personality coevolves with the different roles individuals play in  
7 organizations over time (e.g., Tasselli et al., 2015).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 An increased understanding of personality change and flexibility has implications for  
16 research concerning the match between people and jobs. Job demands activate specific aspects of  
17 personality with consequences for individual performance at work (Hogan & Holland, 2003; Tett  
18 & Burnett, 2003). And the extent to which the individual's personality is congruent with the  
19 demands of the job affects both job attitudes (e.g., O'Reilly, 1977) and job performance (e.g.,  
20 Judge & Zapata, 2015; O'Reilly, 1977). This line of research has assumed fixed personality  
21 characteristics. Future research can examine the consequences of individuals' efforts to change  
22 aspects of their personalities to fit the characteristics of jobs, and whether the occupation of  
23 idiosyncratic organizational roles, including leadership positions, can generate relevant  
24 personality change in the service of organizational functioning. Future work should also examine  
25 how personality change, triggered by network roles or external events, can produce a misfit  
26 between individuals and their career paths with outcomes that may be more positive than  
27 negative for individuals (e.g., Kleinbaum, 2012).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 ***Task design.*** Not everyone may be equally capable of personality change within the  
46 context of fit with job roles. In task design research, there has been consistent interest in growth  
47 need strength, which represents the individual's desire to grow and develop within the job role  
48 (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Pindek, Kessler, & Spector, 2017). Research shows that people with  
49 high growth need strength respond to supportive work contexts with more creative performance  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outcomes (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2009). Future work is needed to investigate whether  
4 interventions that have proved successful in changing personality in non-work settings are  
5 successful in affecting personality change in professional contexts in which people experience  
6 stress and work pressure.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12         There is also a need for further research on the extent to which managers contribute to  
13 person-job fit by assigning individuals specific roles and tasks in the organization that prompt  
14 personality change. Relatedly, the question arises as to whether organizations can improve their  
15 overall performance by stimulating employees' positive personality change via organizational  
16 and job design. Behaviorally, the question arises as to whether organizations can improve their  
17 overall performance by stimulating employees' positive personality change via organizational  
18 and job design. Behavioral changes repeated over time can shape individuals' personality traits  
19 (Magidson et al., 2014; Roberts & Jackson, 2008). People have agency in this process: To the  
20 extent that they invest over time in organizational roles, they tend to enhance the positive aspects  
21 of their personalities (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007). Future research can investigate the  
22 personality changes inherent in individuals' decisions to radically change their jobs and  
23 professions (e.g., Ibarra, 1999).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35         A further concept that may be useful in understanding the links between personality  
36 change and the social context in which jobs are executed is situational *strength*, defined in terms  
37 of "implicit or explicit cues provided by external entities regarding the desirability of potential  
38 behaviors" (Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida, 2009: 122). There is debate concerning whether an  
39 employee who belongs to two or more cohesive cliques faces highly constraining pressures  
40 (Krackhardt, 1999), or whether the cross-pressures from being a "multiple insider" who brokers  
41 across cliques frees the individual to enhance innovation by transferring ideas between otherwise  
42 disconnected individuals (Vedres & Stark, 2010). New research suggests that different  
43 personality types are differentially trusted to play this multiple insider role (Tasselli & Kilduff,  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2017). What is unclear is whether these kinds of vital informal brokerage tasks change  
4  
5 personality, and whether, conversely, being embedded in a single clique protects the individual  
6  
7 from pressures to change personality.  
8  
9

10 ***Personnel selection and development.*** The use of personality measures to select people for  
11  
12 jobs continues to generate research interest (Ryan & Ployhart, 2013), especially given that  
13  
14 personality is used for selection and development efforts for senior executives in organizations  
15  
16 and for those seen as possessing high potential (Church & Rotolo, 2013). But the view of  
17  
18 personality as changeable casts new light on the role of personality in personnel selection and  
19  
20 development. For example, future research can explore how trait malleability affects choices  
21  
22 about whether to hire people whose personality profiles do not initially align with the typical  
23  
24 candidate profile associated with job success. Is it the case that, among a set of personality traits  
25  
26 linked with job success, some are more malleable than others? Armed with knowledge of which  
27  
28 traits are most malleable to change over time, employers may find themselves able to make  
29  
30 informed choices about whether new employees' organizational experiences are likely to change  
31  
32 their traits over time, resulting in higher chances of employee success.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 The emphasis in personnel management has been on the development of positive skills  
39  
40 and abilities. Neglected in this research endeavor is the question of how dark-side personality  
41  
42 characteristics (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy – Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus,  
43  
44 2013) flourish in organizational settings, especially among chief executives (e.g., Chatterjee &  
45  
46 Hambrick, 2007). What aspects of organizational life may serve to reinforce and increase the  
47  
48 prevalence of personality characteristics associated with diminished leadership effectiveness  
49  
50 (Harms et al., 2011; Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010; Khoo & Burch, 2008)?  
51  
52

### 53 **Broadening and Deepening the Scope of Theory and Measurement**

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           *Alternatives to the Big Five.* If new areas of personality change research are to be  
4 opened, then researchers have to look for evidence of personality change rather than stability.  
5 Personality change at the individual level may be “obscured or nullified” in the typical aggregate  
6 studies of the Big Five that are standard in the field (Aldwin & Levenson, 1994). Correlations  
7 across time on personality dimensions of the order of .4 to .6 may mask evidence of considerable  
8 change at the individual as opposed to the group level (Aldwin & Levenson, 1994; Lamiell,  
9 1987).

10  
11           Thus, the view of the Big Five as a stable input into many organizational processes  
12 (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012: 11) is challenged by the extent to which personality changes (in  
13 part driven by volitional change – Hudson & Fraley, 2017). In organizations, the pressure for  
14 people to adapt themselves to changing roles and requirements is often intense (e.g., Raghuram,  
15 Wiesenfeld, & Garud, 2003). If “the importance of workers’ ability to adapt to novel situations in  
16 the workplace and perform at an elevated level may currently be more crucial than ever” (Huang  
17 et al., 2014: 162), then the investigation of whether, how, and when personality changes in  
18 organizations represents a vital research direction.

19  
20           In contrast to prevailing orthodoxy, a change perspective on personality recognizes the  
21 flexibility of the individual in adaptation to these pressures for change. Indeed, people differ in  
22 the extent to which they adjust their underlying personality profile (in terms, for example, of the  
23 Big Five) to situational contingencies. As an indicator of this role flexibility, the self-monitoring  
24 personality construct has emerged as “especially relevant to network advantage” (Burt, Kilduff,  
25 & Tasselli, 2013: 538) because it captures the extent to which people exhibit a flexible,  
26 responsive orientation to social cues and situational demands (Snyder, 1974). High self-monitors  
27 monitor social situations and adapt their attitudes and behaviors appropriately (Gangestad &  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Snyder, 2000; Turnley & Bolino, 2001), whereas low self-monitors strive to be true to  
4 themselves in terms of adhering to their core values and beliefs (see Day, Schleicher, Unckless,  
5 & Hiller, 2002, for a meta-analysis of research in organizational settings). Research shows that  
6 self-monitoring moderates the relationship between Big Five personality traits and job  
7 performance such that Five-Factor traits are predictive of low self-monitors rather than high self-  
8 monitors (Barrick, Parks, & Mount, 2005; Oh, Charlier, Mount, & Berry, 2014).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

It remains an open question whether the flexible personality patterns of high self-monitors result not just in temporary but in long-term personality change. If high self-monitors (relative to low self-monitors) tend to change more of their traits over time, then such adaptability may help explain why high self-monitors are more successful in organizational careers requiring flexibility of self-presentation (Day & Schleicher, 2006; Kilduff & Day, 1994).

Related to self-monitoring differences is the notion – discrepant with traditional trait approaches, including the Big Five – that people vary in the extent to which their personalities are weak or strong. The construct of personality strength is defined as “the forcefulness of implicit or explicit internal cues regarding the desirability of potential behaviors” (Dalal et al., 2015: 263). Strong personalities tend to exhibit little variance in their behavior across situations, in the same way that low self-monitors strive to maintain consistency of behavior despite environmental cues. Future research, therefore, can investigate the characteristics that differentiate weak from strong personalities, whether strong personalities exhibit little underlying personality change over time relative to weak personalities, and whether personality change is related to outcomes in organizations, such as performance, promotion, and income, according to the social situations and organizational roles that people occupy.

1  
2  
3 To actually capture personality change at the individual as opposed to the aggregate level  
4 requires a rethinking of personality measurement. An idiographic perspective on personality  
5 offers one way to capture change at the individual level and yet preserve an overall nomothetic  
6 approach to personality differences (Lamiell, 2014). Idiographic approaches (e.g., Kelly, 1955)  
7 are able to reconcile evidence of personality change over time and situations with our sense that  
8 each individual nevertheless maintains an ongoing and distinctive self. Idiographic approaches  
9 provide an affirmative answer to the question of whether there is some psychological feature that  
10 remains stable despite the changing stream of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that individuals  
11 exhibit.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 One contemporary idiographic perspective models the variability in personality patterns  
25 over time and across social situations by way of distinctive, individual behavioral signatures (cf.  
26 Shoda, Mischel, & Wright, 1994: 674). A professor might have a distinctive extraversion  
27 signature, for example, that includes garrulous sociability in lecturing situations and in  
28 departmental meetings combined with inhibition and restraint at social events. Idiographic  
29 perspectives can help organizational researchers understand how individuals change personality  
30 expression across organizational roles and situations even as individuals exhibit distinctive  
31 patterns of cognitive and behavioral consistency.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 ***Broad or narrow change?*** The understanding of personality as a dynamic entity entails  
43 these key questions: At what level of personality is change most likely? Do people exhibit broad  
44 patterns of change in response to coworkers and job demands in the work environment? Or do  
45 people exhibit change on one or more narrower characteristics? Personality traits are typically  
46 arranged hierarchically, with broad higher-order traits such as conscientiousness subsuming  
47 narrower lower-order traits such as industriousness and orderliness (see, for example, DeYoung,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Quilty, & Peterson, 2007). Researchers have focused on broad patterns of personality change,  
4 given the attraction of the Big Five as a comprehensive organizing framework (e.g., see the  
5 meta-analysis of predictable mean-level change in Big Five personality dimensions over the life  
6 course: Roberts et al., 2006). But the focus on the Big Five dimensions of personality obscures  
7 potentially meaningful and interesting changes occurring at narrower, more specific aspects of  
8 the individual's personality.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Future research can explore the extent to which personality changes within narrow aspects of each of the broad traits. For example, extraversion includes both sociability and assertiveness. Working alongside a chatty coworker may promote change in the individual's sociability, but leave unchanged the individual's assertiveness. Similarly, orderliness and industriousness are both aspects of conscientiousness, and both may be changed through the day-to-day experience of working as a post office clerk. Examining change only at the level of broad traits obscures patterns of change at more granular levels of personality.

Future research, therefore, can examine how relationships in the workplace relate to change in specific facets of the individual's personality, building on recent research (Mund & Neyer, 2014) that shows how personality measured only in terms of broad personality factors (i.e., the Big Five – Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Neyer & Asendorpf, 2001) can obscure the effects of relationships on personality change. Mund and Neyer (2014) found numerous effects of relationship experiences on personality change with regard to narrow facets such as negative affect and self-reproach (facets of neuroticism). There were three times as many relationship effects on personality facets as compared to the broad characteristics of personality.

A useful theoretical framework for addressing levels issues emerges in trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003) that conceives of the work environment as offering a host of

1  
2  
3 interpersonal cues, each of which provides opportunities for trait expression. These cues come in  
4  
5 different forms, including cues at the social level (a friendly coworker who wishes to chat), at the  
6  
7 task level (having to discuss the features of a computer with a customer to make a sale), and at  
8  
9 the organizational level (working in a company in which collegial values of collaboration are  
10  
11 emphasized). Trait activation concepts are useful for understanding which aspects of personality  
12  
13 are likely to be expressed and, by extension, undergo change over time. The behaviors that  
14  
15 people routinely engage in can become crystallized in actual changes to underlying personality  
16  
17 traits (Hudson & Fraley, 2015).  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **CONCLUSION**

22  
23  
24 Can the individual's personality change? The answer from this review is that, even  
25  
26 without personal volition, the individual is likely to experience positive change over the life  
27  
28 course in terms of increased social dominance, conscientiousness, and emotional stability  
29  
30 (Roberts et al., 2006). But we have also uncovered evidence that individuals can make personal  
31  
32 efforts to engage in habitual actions that will accumulate into trait-level personality change (e.g.,  
33  
34 Lyubomirsky et al., 2005b). Implications for organizational behavior research are profound. No  
35  
36 longer can personality be relegated to the predictive, immutable status of an independent  
37  
38 variable; personality can also be seen as a dependent variable – an outcome of self-development  
39  
40 efforts, positive work environments, job roles, and work-related interactions. Of course,  
41  
42 personality change can be inhibited by organizational routines that require people to enact  
43  
44 precisely the same attitudes and behaviors day after day like an actor going through the motions  
45  
46 on the stage (March & Simon, 1958).  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 If the old maxim was that personality was unchanging, the new maxim from this review  
53  
54 is that personality change is to be expected and, therefore, managed in organizations in which  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 people experiment with provisional selves (e.g., Ibarra, 1999), and in which events and processes  
4  
5 inside and outside of organizations shape personality with consequences for identity and  
6  
7 reputation. The new view of organizations is one of arenas in which people experience profound  
8  
9 changes to what have been considered immutable aspects of the self. Personality change may be  
10  
11 one of the most vital outcomes of organizational experience.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. 1985. Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7: 263–295.
- 7  
8 Aldwin, C. M., & Levenson, M. R. 1994. Aging and personality assessment. In M. P. Lawton &  
9 J. A. Teresi (Eds.), *Annual review of gerontology and geriatrics: Focus on assessment techniques*, 14: 182–209. New York: Springer.
- 10  
11 Alicke, M. D., & Sedikides, C. (Eds.) 2011. *Handbook of self-enhancement and self-protection*. New York: Guilford Press.
- 12  
13 Allport, G. W. 1937. *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: H Holt &  
14 Company.
- 15  
16 Allport, G. W. 1961. *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- 17  
18 Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. 1936. Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47: i–171.
- 19  
20 Asendorpf, J. B., & Wilpers, S. 1998. Personality effects on social relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74: 1531–1544.
- 21  
22 Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. 2005. Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of  
23 positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16: 315–338.
- 24  
25 Balkundi, P., Kilduff, M., & Harrison, D. A. 2011. Centrality and charisma: Comparing how  
26 leader networks and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 1209–1222.
- 27  
28 Bandura, A. 1999. Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3: 193–209.
- 29  
30 Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job  
31 performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1–26.
- 32  
33 Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. 2005. Self-monitoring as a moderator of the  
34 relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58:  
35 745–767.
- 36  
37 Baumeister, R. F., Dale, K., & Sommer, K. L. 1998. Freudian defense mechanisms and empirical  
38 findings in modern social psychology: Reaction formation, projection, displacement,  
39 undoing, isolation, sublimation, and denial. *Journal of Personality*, 66: 1081–1124.
- 40  
41 Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal  
42 attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117: 497–529.
- 43  
44 Bell, N. E., & Staw, B. M. 1989. People as sculptors versus sculpture: The roles of personality  
45 and personal control in organizations. *Handbook of Career Theory*, 11: 232–250.
- 46  
47 Bem, D. J., & Allen, A. 1974. On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for  
48 cross-situational consistencies in behavior. *Psychological Review*, 81: 506–520.
- 49  
50 Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. 2007. Interpersonal deviance, organizational  
51 deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 410–424.
- 52  
53 Block, J. H., & Airasian, P. W. 1971. *Mastery learning: Theory and practice*. New York: Holt  
54 Rinehart & Winston.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Bloom, B. S. 1964. *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: John Wiley &  
4 Sons.  
5  
6 Blume, B. D., Baldwin, T. T., & Ryan, K. C. 2013. Communication apprehension: A barrier to  
7 students' leadership, adaptability, and multicultural appreciation. *Academy of*  
8 *Management Learning & Education*, 12: 158–172.  
9  
10 Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A. 1995. A framework for studying personality in the stress process.  
11 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69: 890–902.  
12  
13 Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. 2004. Personality and transformational and transactional leadership:  
14 A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 901–910.  
15  
16 Borman, W. C. 1987. Personal constructs, performance schemata, and “folk theories” of  
17 subordinate effectiveness: Explorations in an army officer sample. *Organizational*  
18 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40: 307–322.  
19  
20 Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. 2001. Personality predictors of  
21 citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9: 52–69.  
22  
23 Boyce, C. J., Wood, A. M., Daly, M., & Sedikides, C. 2015. Personality change following  
24 unemployment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 991–1011.  
25  
26 Brickman, P., & Campbell, D. T. 1971. Hedonic relativism and planning the good science. In M.  
27 H. Appley (Ed.), *Adaptation-level theory*: 287–305. New York: Academic Press.  
28  
29 Brooks, D. N., & McKinlay, W. 1983. Personality and behavioural change after severe blunt  
30 head injury – a relative's view. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 46:  
31 336–344.  
32  
33 Brousseau, K. R., & Prince, J. B. 1981. Job-person dynamics: An extension of longitudinal  
34 research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66: 59–62.  
35  
36 Burt, R. S. 2012. Network-related personality and the agency question: Multirole evidence from  
37 a virtual world. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118: 543–591.  
38  
39 Burt, R. S., Kilduff, M., & Tasselli, S. 2013. Social network analysis: Foundations and frontiers  
40 on advantage. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64: 527–547.  
41  
42 Cacioppo, J. T., Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. 2009. Alone in the crowd: The structure and  
43 spread of loneliness in a large social network. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
44 *Psychology*, 97: 977–991.  
45  
46 Cahalan, D., Cisin, I. H., & Crossley, H. M. 1969. *American drinking practices: A national*  
47 *study of drinking behavior and attitudes*. Monographs of the Rutgers Center of Alcohol  
48 Studies.  
49  
50 Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. 2002. The hopeful optimist. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13: 288–290.  
51  
52 Casciaro, T., Barsade, S. G., Edmondson, A. C., Gibson, C. B., Krackhardt, D., & Labianca, G.  
53 2015. The integration of psychological and network perspectives in organizational  
54 scholarship. *Organization Science*, 26: 1162–1176.  
55  
56 Chapman, B. P., Hampson, S., & Clarkin, J. 2014. Personality-informed interventions for healthy  
57 aging: Conclusions from a National Institute on Aging work group. *Developmental*  
58 *Psychology*, 50: 1426–1441.  
59  
60 Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. 2007. It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers  
and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science*  
*Quarterly*, 52: 351–386.

- 1  
2  
3 Cherulnik, P. D., Donley, K. A., Wiewel, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. 2001. Charisma is contagious:  
4 The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social*  
5 *Psychology*, 31: 2149–2159.  
6
- 7 Church, A. H., & Rotolo, C. T. 2013. How are top companies assessing their high-potentials and  
8 senior executives? A talent management benchmark study. *Consulting Psychology*  
9 *Journal: Practice and Research*, 65: 199–223.  
10
- 11 Clark, D. M., Ehlers, A., McManus, F., Hackmann, A., Fennell, M., Campbell, H., Flower, T.,  
12 Davenport, C., & Louis, B. 2003. Cognitive therapy versus fluoxetine in generalized  
13 social phobia: A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and*  
14 *Clinical Psychology*, 71: 1058–1067.  
15
- 16 Cloninger, C. R. 1986. A unified biosocial theory of personality and its role in the development  
17 of anxiety states. *Psychiatric Developments*, 3: 167–226.  
18
- 19 Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Schurer, S. 2012. The stability of Big Five personality traits. *Economics*  
20 *Letters*, 115: 11–15.  
21
- 22 Cohen, G. L., & Garcia, J. 2008. Identity, belonging, and achievement: A model, interventions,  
23 implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17: 365–369.  
24
- 25 Cohen, G. L., & Sherman, D. K. 2014. The psychology of change: Self-affirmation and social  
26 psychological intervention. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65: 333–371.  
27
- 28 Colbert, A. E., Bono, J. E., & Purvanova, R. K. 2016. Flourishing via workplace relationships:  
29 Moving beyond instrumental support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 1199–  
30 1223.  
31
- 32 Collins, C. J., Hanges, P. J., & Locke, E. A. 2004. The relationship of achievement motivation to  
33 entrepreneurial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance*, 17: 95–117.  
34
- 35 Cornelius, N. 2015. Personal construct theory, research, and practice in the field of business and  
36 management. In D. A. Winter & N. Reed (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of personal*  
37 *construct psychology*: 267–281. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.  
38
- 39 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. 1998. Trait theories of personality. In D. F. Barone, M. Hersen, &  
40 V. B. V. Hasselt (Eds), *Advanced personality*: 103–121. New York: Plenum.  
41
- 42 Cuijpers, P., Donker, T., van Straten, A., Li, J., & Andersson, G. 2010. Is guided self-help as  
43 effective as face-to-face psychotherapy for depression and anxiety disorders? A  
44 systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies. *Psychological*  
45 *Medicine*, 40: 1943–1957.  
46
- 47 Dabbs, J. M., Hargrove, M. F., & Heusel, C. 1996. Testosterone differences among college  
48 fraternities: Well-behaved vs. rambunctious. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20:  
49 157–161.  
50
- 51 Dalal, R. S., Meyer, R. D., Bradshaw, R. P., Green, J. P., Kelly, E. D., & Zhu, M. 2015.  
52 Personality strength and situational influences on behavior: A conceptual review and  
53 research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 41: 261–287.  
54
- 55 Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. 1989. Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in  
56 organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 385–400.  
57
- 58 Day, D. V., & Schleicher, D. J. 2006. Self-monitoring at work: A motive-based perspective.  
59 *Journal of Personality*, 74: 685–714.  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. 2002. Self-monitoring personality at  
4 work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied*  
5 *Psychology*, 87: 390–401.  
6  
7 Deinert, A., Homan, A. C., Boer, D., Voelpel, S. C., & Gutermann, D. 2015. Transformational  
8 leadership sub-dimensions and their link to leaders' personality and performance. *The*  
9 *Leadership Quarterly*, 26: 1095–1120.  
10  
11 Detert, J., & Bruno, E. 2017. Workplace courage: Review, synthesis, and future agenda for a  
12 complex construct. *Academy of Management Annals*. Forthcoming.  
13  
14 de Vries, T. A., Walter, F., Van der Vegt, G. S., & Essens, P. J. 2014. Antecedents of individuals'  
15 interteam coordination: Broad functional experiences as a mixed blessing. *Academy of*  
16 *Management Journal*, 57: 1334–1359.  
17  
18 DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. 2007. Between facets and domains: Ten aspects  
19 of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93: 880–96.  
20  
21 Dickie, V. A. 2003. Establishing worker identity: A study of people in craftwork. *American*  
22 *Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 57: 250–261.  
23  
24 Didehbani, N., Cullum, C. M., Mansinghani, S., Conover, H., & Hart, J. 2013. Depressive  
25 symptoms and concussions in aging retired NFL players. *Archives of Clinical*  
26 *Neuropsychology*, 28: 418–424.  
27  
28 Du, L., Bakish, D., Ravindran, A. V., & Hrdina, P. D. 2002. Does fluoxetine influence major  
29 depression by modifying five-factor personality traits?. *Journal of Affective Disorders*,  
30 71: 235–241.  
31  
32 Dweck, C. S. 1999. *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality and development*.  
33 Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis/Psychology Press.  
34  
35 Dweck, C. S. 2008. Can personality be changed? The role of beliefs in personality and change.  
36 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17: 391–394.  
37  
38 Eden, C., & Ackermann, F. 2010. Decision making in groups: Theory and practice. In P. C. Nutt  
39 & D. C. Wilson (Eds.), *Handbook of decision making*: 231–272. Chichester, UK: John  
40 Wiley & Sons.  
41  
42 Edmonds, G. W., Jackson, J. J., Fayard, J. V., & Roberts, B. W. 2008. Is character fate, or is there  
43 hope to change my personality yet? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2:  
44 399–413.  
45  
46 Epstein, S., & O'Brien, E. J. 1985. The person-situation debate in historical and current  
47 perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98: 513–537.  
48  
49 Ertug, G., & Castellucci, F. 2013. Getting what you need: How reputation and status affect team  
50 performance, hiring, and salaries in the NBA. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56:  
51 407–431.  
52  
53 Fang, R., Landis, B., Zhang, Z., Anderson, M. H., Shaw, J. D., & Kilduff, M. 2015. Integrating  
54 personality and social networks: A meta-analysis of personality, network position, and  
55 work outcomes in organizations. *Organization Science*, 26: 1243–1260.  
56  
57 Farmer, R. F., & Chapman, A. L. 2016. *Behavioral activation*. Washington D.C.: American  
58 Psychological Association.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Feiler, D. C., & Kleinbaum, A. M. 2015. Popularity, similarity, and the network extraversion  
4 bias. *Psychological Science*, 26: 593–603.
- 5  
6 Fink, K. 2003. Magnitude of trauma and personality change. *The International Journal of*  
7 *Psychoanalysis*, 84: 985–995.
- 8  
9 Fleeson, W. 2004. Moving personality beyond the person-situation debate: The challenge and the  
10 opportunity of within-person variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*,  
11 13: 83–87.
- 12  
13 Foulk, T., Woolum, A., & Erez, A. 2016. Catching rudeness is like catching a cold: The  
14 contagion effects of low-intensity negative behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,  
15 101: 50–67.
- 16  
17 Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. 2008. Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network:  
18 longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *British Medical*  
19 *Journal*, 337: a2338.
- 20  
21 Freud, S. 1923. *The ego and the id*. Standard edition, 19: 3–66. London: Hogarth Press.
- 22  
23 Funder, D. C. 1991. Global traits: A neo-Allportian approach to personality. *Psychological*  
24 *Science*, 2: 31–39.
- 25  
26 Funder, D. C. 1997. *The personality puzzle*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- 27  
28 Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. 2013. The Dark Triad of personality: A 10 year  
29 review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7: 199–216.
- 30  
31 Gable, S. L., & Haidt, J. 2005. What (and why) is positive psychology? *Review of General*  
32 *Psychology*, 9: 103–110.
- 33  
34 Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. 2000. Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal.  
35 *Psychological Bulletin*, 126: 530–555.
- 36  
37 Garcia, J., & Cohen, G. L. 2013. A social psychological approach to educational intervention. In  
38 E. Shafir (Ed.), *The behavioral foundations of policy*: 329–350. Princeton, NJ: Princeton  
39 University Press.
- 40  
41 Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. 2011. Authentic leadership: A  
42 review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22: 1120–1145.
- 43  
44 Gendlin, E. T. 1964. A theory of personality change. In P. Worchel & D. Byrne (Eds.),  
45 *Personality change*: 100–148. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- 46  
47 Gerhart, B. 1987. How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction?  
48 Implications for job design and other personnel programs. *Journal of Applied*  
49 *Psychology*, 72: 366–373.
- 50  
51 Gerhart, B. 2005. The (affective) dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Sorting out the  
52 policy implications. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 79–97.
- 53  
54 Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. 2000. Organizational identity, image, and adaptive  
55 instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 63–81.
- 56  
57 Glenn, N. D. 1980. Values, attitudes, and beliefs. In O. G. Brim, Jr. & J. Kagan (Eds.),  
58 *Constancy and change in human development*: 596–640. Cambridge, MA: Harvard  
59 University Press.
- 60  
61 Goffman, E. 1961. On the characteristics of total institutions. In *Symposium on preventive and*  
62 *social psychiatry*: 43–84. Washington D.C.: Walter Reed Army Medical Centre.

- 1  
2  
3 Goldberg, L. R. 1993. The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48:  
4 26-34.
- 5  
6 Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. 2009. Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and  
7 proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3: 317–375.
- 8  
9 Grounds, A. 2004. Psychological consequences of wrongful conviction and imprisonment.  
10 *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 46: 165–182.
- 11  
12 Guiora, A. Z., & Acton, W. R. 1979. Personality and language behavior: A restatement.  
13 *Language Learning*, 29: 193–204.
- 14  
15 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1976. Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory.  
16 *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16: 250–279.
- 17  
18 Halbesleben, J. R., & Bowler, W. M. 2007. Emotional exhaustion and job performance: The  
19 mediating role of motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 93–106.
- 20  
21 Hall, D. 1995. Unplanned executive transitions and the dance of subidentities. *Human Resource*  
22 *Management*, 34: 71–92.
- 23  
24 Hampson, S. E., & Goldberg, L. R. 2006. A first large cohort study of personality trait stability  
25 over the 40 years between elementary school and midlife. *Journal of Personality and*  
26 *Social Psychology*, 91: 763–779.
- 27  
28 Harms, P. D., Roberts, B. W., & Winter, D. 2006. Becoming the Harvard man: Person-  
29 environment fit, personality development, and academic success. *Personality and Social*  
30 *Psychology Bulletin*, 32: 851–865.
- 31  
32 Harms, P. D., Spain, S. M., & Hannah, S. T. 2011. Leader development and the dark side of  
33 personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22: 495–509.
- 34  
35 Harris, M. A., Brett, C. E., Johnson, W., & Deary, I. J. 2016. Personality stability from age 14 to  
36 age 77 years. *Psychology and Aging*, 31: 862–874.
- 37  
38 Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. 2006. How important are job attitudes? Meta-  
39 analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy*  
40 *of Management Journal*, 49: 305–325.
- 41  
42 Hennecke, M., & Freund, A. M. 2017. The development of goals and motivation. In J. Specht  
43 (Ed.), *Personality development across the lifespan*: 257–273. London: Academic Press.
- 44  
45 Hicks, B. M., Durbin, C. E., Blonigen, D. M., Iacono, W. G., & McGue, M. 2012. Relationship  
46 between personality change and the onset and course of alcohol dependence in young  
47 adulthood. *Addiction*, 107: 540–548.
- 48  
49 Hobfoll, S. E. 1989. Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress.  
50 *American Psychologist*, 44: 513–524.
- 51  
52 Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. 2010. Management derailment. *APA Handbook of*  
53 *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3: 555–575.
- 54  
55 Hogan, J., & Holland, B. 2003. Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance  
56 relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 100–112.
- 57  
58 Hogan, R. 1982. A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. Page & R. Dienstbier (Eds.),  
59 *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*: 55–89. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- 60  
61 Hogan, R. 1996. A socioanalytic perspective. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of*  
*personality: Theoretical perspectives*: 163–217. New York: Guilford Press.

- 1  
2  
3 Huang, J. L., Ryan, A. M., Zabel, K. L., & Palmer, A. 2014. Personality and adaptive  
4 performance at work: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99:  
5 162–179.  
6  
7 Hudson, N. W., & Fraley, R. C. 2015. Volitional personality trait change: Can people choose to  
8 change their personality traits? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109: 490–  
9 507.  
10  
11 Hudson, N. W., & Fraley, R. C. 2016. Changing for the better? Longitudinal associations  
12 between volitional personality change and psychological well-being. *Personality and*  
13 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42: 603–615.  
14  
15 Hudson, N. W., & Fraley, R. C. 2017. Volitional personality change. In J. Specht (Ed.),  
16 *Personality development across the lifespan*: 401–417. London: Academic Press.  
17  
18 Hudson, N. W., & Roberts, B. W. 2016. Social investment in work reliably predicts change in  
19 conscientiousness and agreeableness: A direct replication and extension of Hudson,  
20 Roberts, and Lodi-Smith (2012). *Journal of Research in Personality*, 60: 12–23.  
21  
22 Hülür, G. 2017. Cohort differences in personality. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality development*  
23 *across the lifespan*: 520–536. London: Academic Press.  
24  
25 Ibarra, H. 1999. Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional  
26 adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 764–791.  
27  
28 Jackson, J. J. 2011. *The effects of educational experiences on personality trait development*.  
29 Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.  
30  
31 Jackson, J. J., Bogg, T., Walton, K. E., Wood, D., Harms, P. D., Lodi-Smith, J., Edmonds, G.  
32 W., & Roberts, B. W. 2009. Not all conscientiousness scales change alike: A  
33 multimethod, multisample study of age differences in the facets of  
34 conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96: 446–459.  
35  
36 Jackson, J. J., Thoemmes, F., Jonkmann, K., Lüdtke, O., & Trautwein, U. 2012. Military training  
37 and personality trait development: Does the military make the man, or does the man  
38 make the military? *Psychological Science*, 23: 270–277.  
39  
40 James, W. 1890. *The principles of psychology* (2 vols). New York: Henry Holt.  
41  
42 James, W. 1988. The moral equivalent of war. In B. Kuklick (Ed.), *Writings 1902–1910*: 1281–  
43 1293. New York: Library of America. (Original work published 1910).  
44  
45 Jang, K. L., McCrae, R. R., Angleitner, A., Riemann, R., & Livesley, W. J. 1998. Heritability of  
46 facet-level traits in a cross-cultural twin sample: Support for a hierarchical model of  
47 personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74: 1556–1565.  
48  
49 Jayawickreme, E., & Blackie, L. E. 2014. Post-traumatic growth as positive personality change:  
50 Evidence, controversies and future directions. *European Journal of Personality*, 28:  
51 312–331.  
52  
53 Johnson, W., McGue, M., & Krueger, R. F. 2005. Personality stability in late adulthood: A  
54 behavioral genetic analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 73: 523–552.  
55  
56 Jokela, M., Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. 2009. Personality and  
57 having children: A two-way relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
58 96: 218–230.  
59  
60 Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. 2002a. Personality and leadership: A  
qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 765–780.

- 1  
2  
3 Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. 1995. An empirical investigation of  
4 the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 485–519.
- 5  
6 Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. 2002b. Five-factor model of personality and job  
7 satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 530–541.
- 8  
9 Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. 2002. Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-  
10 analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 797–807.
- 11  
12 Judge, T. A., & Zapata, C. P. 2015. The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation  
13 strength and trait activation on the validity of the Big Five personality traits in predicting  
14 job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 1149–1179.
- 15  
16 Kahn, W. A. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at  
17 work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 692–724.
- 18  
19 Kelly, G. A. 1955. *The psychology of personal constructs* (2 vols). New York: W. W. Norton &  
20 Co.
- 21  
22 Kelly, G. A. 1963. *A theory of personality*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- 23  
24 Khoo, H. S., & Burch, G. S. J. 2008. The “dark side” of leadership personality and  
25 transformational leadership: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual  
26 Differences*, 44: 86–97.
- 27  
28 Kilduff, M., Crossland, C., Tsai, W., & Bowers, M. T. 2016. Magnification and correction of the  
29 acolyte effect: Initial benefits and ex post settling up in NFL coaching careers. *Academy  
30 of Management Journal*, 59: 352–375.
- 31  
32 Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. 1994. Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on  
33 managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 1047–1060.
- 34  
35 Klein, K. J., Lim, B. C., Saltz, J. L., & Mayer, D. M. 2004. How do they get there? An  
36 examination of the antecedents of centrality in team networks. *Academy of Management  
37 Journal*, 47: 952–963.
- 38  
39 Kleinbaum, A. M. 2012. Organizational misfits and the origins of brokerage in intrafirm  
40 networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57: 407–452.
- 41  
42 Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. 1978. The reciprocal effects of the substantive complexity of work  
43 and intellectual flexibility: A longitudinal assessment. *American Journal of Sociology*,  
44 84: 24–52.
- 45  
46 Kouchaki, M., & Desai, S. D. 2015. Anxious, threatened, and also unethical: How anxiety makes  
47 individuals feel threatened and commit unethical acts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,  
48 100: 360–375.
- 49  
50 Krackhardt, D. 1999. The ties that torture: Simmelian tie analysis in organizations. *Research in  
51 the Sociology of Organizations*, 16: 183–210.
- 52  
53 Lamb, H. R., & Weinberger, L. E. 1998. Persons with severe mental illness in jails and prisons:  
54 A review. *Psychiatric Services*, 43: 483–492.
- 55  
56 Lamiell, J. T. 1987. *The psychology of personality: An epistemological inquiry*. New York:  
57 Columbia University Press.
- 58  
59 Lamiell, J. T. 2014. The case for an idiothetic psychology of personality: A conceptual and  
60 empirical foundation. *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, 11: 1–64.
- Landis, B. 2016. Personality and social networks in organizations: A review and future  
directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31: S107–S121.

- 1  
2  
3 Lehnart, J., & Neyer, F. J. 2006. Should I stay or should I go? Attachment and personality in  
4 stable and instable romantic relationships. *European Journal of Personality*, 20: 475–  
5 495.  
6  
7 Li, N., Barrick, M. R., Zimmerman, R. D., & Chiaburu, D. S. 2014. Retaining the productive  
8 employee: The role of personality. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8: 347–395.  
9  
10 Li, W. D., Fay, D., Frese, M., Harms, P. D., & Gao, X. Y. 2014. Reciprocal relationship between  
11 proactive personality and work characteristics: A latent change score approach. *Journal*  
12 *of Applied Psychology*, 99: 948–965.  
13  
14 Little, B. R. 1983. Personal projects: A rationale and method for investigation. *Environment and*  
15 *Behavior*, 15: 273–309.  
16  
17 Littlefield, A. K., Sher, K. J., & Wood, P. K. 2009. Is “maturing out” of problematic alcohol  
18 involvement related to personality change? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 118: 360–  
19 374.  
20  
21 Liu, J., Chen, X., Li, D., & French, D. 2012. Shyness□sensitivity, aggression, and adjustment in  
22 urban Chinese adolescents at different historical times. *Journal of Research on*  
23 *Adolescence*, 22: 393–399.  
24  
25 Lodi-Smith, J., & Roberts, B. W. 2007. Social investment and personality: A meta-analysis of  
26 the relationship of personality traits to investment in work, family, religion, and  
27 volunteerism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11: 68–86.  
28  
29 Lorrain, F., & White, H. C. 1971. Structural equivalence of individuals in social networks.  
30 *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 1: 49–80.  
31  
32 Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E. 2004. Unemployment alters the set point  
33 for life satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 15: 8–13.  
34  
35 Lüdtkke, O., Roberts, B. W., Trautwein, U., & Nagy, G. 2011. A random walk down university  
36 avenue: Life paths, life events, and personality trait change at the transition to university  
37 life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101: 620–637.  
38  
39 Luthans, F. 2002. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of*  
40 *Organizational Behavior*, 23: 695–706.  
41  
42 Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. 2003. Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K.  
43 S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*:  
44 241–261. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.  
45  
46 Lykken, D., & Tellegen, A. 1996. Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological*  
47 *Science*, 7: 186–189.  
48  
49 Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. 2005a. The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does  
50 happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131: 803–855.  
51  
52 Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. 2005a. Pursuing happiness: The architecture of  
53 sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology*, 9: 111–131.  
54  
55 Magidson, J. F., Roberts, B. W., Collado-Rodriguez, A., & Lejuez, C. W. 2014. Theory-driven  
56 intervention for changing personality: Expectancy value theory, behavioral activation,  
57 and conscientiousness. *Developmental Psychology*, 50: 1442–1450.  
58  
59 Mahoney, M. J. 2002. Constructivism and positive psychology. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez  
60 (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology*: 45–750. New York: Oxford University Press.  
March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. 1958. *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- 1  
2  
3 Maslow, A. 1954. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- 4 Maslow, A. 1968. *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- 5  
6 Maurer, T. J., & Lippstreu, M. 2008. Expert vs. general working sample differences in KSAO  
7 “improvability” ratings and relationships with measures relevant to occupational and  
8 organizational psychology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,  
9 81: 813–829.
- 10  
11 McAdams, D. P. 1993. *The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self*. New  
12 York: Guilford Press.
- 13  
14 McClelland, D. C. 1965. Toward a theory of motive acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 20:  
15 321–333.
- 16  
17 McClelland, D. C. 1987. *Human motivation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 18  
19 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. 1994. The stability of personality: Observations and evaluations.  
20 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 3: 173–175.
- 21  
22 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. 2003. *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*.  
23 New York: Guilford Press.
- 24  
25 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. 2008. Empirical and theoretical status of the five-factor model of  
26 personality traits. In G. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE*  
27 *handbook of personality theory and assessment*: 273–294. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 28  
29 McLean, K. C. 2017. And the story evolves: The development of personal narratives and  
30 narrative identity. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality development across the lifespan*: 325–  
31 338. London: Academic Press.
- 32  
33 McQueen, A., & Klein, W. M. 2006. Experimental manipulations of self-affirmation: A  
34 systematic review. *Self Identity*, 5: 289–354.
- 35  
36 Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. 2009. A review and synthesis of situational strength in  
37 the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36: 121–140.
- 38  
39 Miller, A. 2008. A critique of positive psychology – or “the new science of happiness”. *Journal*  
40 *of Philosophy of Education*, 42: 591–608.
- 41  
42 Mischel, W. 1968. *Personality and assessment*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- 43  
44 Mischel, W. 1973. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality.  
45 *Psychological Review*, 80: 252–283.
- 46  
47 Mischel, W. 1979. On the interface of cognition and personality: Beyond the person-situation  
48 debate. *American Psychologist*, 34: 740–754.
- 49  
50 Mischel, W. 2004. Toward an integrative science of the person. *Annual Review of Psychology*,  
51 55: 1–22.
- 52  
53 Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. 1995. A cognitive-affective system theory of personality:  
54 Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality  
55 structure. *Psychological Review*, 102: 246–268.
- 56  
57 Mitchell, T. R. 1997. Matching motivational strategies with organizational contexts. *Research in*  
58 *Organizational Behavior*, 19: 57–150.
- 59  
60 Mortimer, J. T., & Lorence, J. 1979. Work experience and occupational value socialization: A  
longitudinal study. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84: 1361–1385.

- 1  
2  
3 Mroczek, D. K., Almeida, D. M., Spiro, A., & Pafford, C. 2006. Modeling intraindividual  
4 stability and change in personality. In D. K. Mroczek & T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of*  
5 *personality development*: 163–180. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.  
6  
7 Mroczek, D. K., & Spiro, A. 2007. Personality change influences mortality in older men.  
8 *Psychological Science*, 18: 371–376.  
9  
10 Mund, M., & Neyer, F. J. 2014. Treating personality-relationship transactions with respect:  
11 Narrow facets, advanced models, and extended time frames. *Journal of Personality and*  
12 *Social Psychology*, 107: 352–368.  
13  
14 Murray, H. A. 1938. *Explorations in personality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.  
15  
16 Neimeyer, R. A. 1993. An appraisal of constructivist psychotherapies. *Journal of Consulting*  
17 *and Clinical Psychology*, 61: 221–234.  
18  
19 Neyer, F. J., & Asendorpf, J. B. 2001. Personality-relationship transaction in young adulthood.  
20 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81: 1190–1204.  
21  
22 Neyer, F. J., & Lehnart, J. 2007. Relationships matter in personality development: Evidence from  
23 an 8-year longitudinal study across young adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, 75: 535–  
24 568.  
25  
26 Niess, C. 2014. *Reciprocal influences between personality traits and career transitions*.  
27 Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cologne.  
28  
29 Oh, I. S., Charlier, S. D., Mount, M. K., & Berry, C. M. 2014. The two faces of high self-  
30 monitors: Chameleonic moderating effects of self-monitoring on the relationships  
31 between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of*  
32 *Organizational Behavior*, 35: 92–111.  
33  
34 O'Reilly, C. A. 1977. Personality-job fit: Implications for individual attitudes and performance.  
35 *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18: 36–46.  
36  
37 Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2010. Expanding the criterion domain to  
38 include organizational citizenship behavior: Implications for employee selection. In S.  
39 Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: 281–323.  
40 Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.  
41  
42 Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional  
43 predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 775–802.  
44  
45 Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. 2010. Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple  
46 proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36: 633–662.  
47  
48 Pervin, L. A. 1994. A critical analysis of current trait theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5: 103–113.  
49  
50 Piedmont, R. L. 2001. Cracking the plaster cast: Big Five personality change during intensive  
51 outpatient counseling. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35: 500–520.  
52  
53 Pindek, S., Kessler, S. R., & Spector, P. E. 2017. A quantitative and qualitative review of what  
54 meta-analyses have contributed to our understanding of human resource management.  
55 *Human Resource Management Review*, 27: 26–38.  
56  
57 Podolny, J. M. 2001. Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market. *American Journal of*  
58 *Sociology*, 107: 33–60.  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. 2006. Constructing professional identity: The  
4 role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical  
5 residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 235–262.
- 6  
7 Priesemuth, M., & Taylor, R. M. 2016. The more I want, the less I have left to give: The  
8 moderating role of psychological entitlement on the relationship between psychological  
9 contract violation, depressive mood states, and citizenship behavior. *Journal of*  
10 *Organizational Behavior*, 37: 967–982.
- 11  
12 Raghuram, S., Wiesenfeld, B., & Garud, R. 2003. Technology enabled work: The role of self-  
13 efficacy in determining telecommuter adjustment and structuring behavior. *Journal of*  
14 *Vocational Behavior*, 63: 180–198.
- 15  
16 Ragins, B. R., Lyness, K. S., Williams, L. J., & Winkel, D. 2014. Life spillovers: The spillover  
17 of fear of home foreclosure to the workplace. *Personnel Psychology*, 67: 763–800.
- 18  
19 Reger, R. K., Gustafson, L. T., Demarie, S. M., & Mullane, J. V. 1994. Reframing the  
20 organization: Why implementing total quality is easier said than done. *Academy of*  
21 *Management Review*, 19: 565–584.
- 22  
23 Robbins, B. D. 2008. What is the good life? Positive psychology and the renaissance of  
24 humanistic psychology. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 36: 96–112.
- 25  
26 Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. 2017. *Organizational behavior*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- 27  
28 Roberts, B. W. 1997. Plaster or plasticity: Are work experiences associated with personality  
29 change in women? *Journal of Personality*, 65: 205–232.
- 30  
31 Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. 2003. Work experiences and personality development  
32 in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84: 582–593.
- 33  
34 Roberts, B. W., & Donahue, E. M. 1994. One personality, multiple selves: Integrating  
35 personality and social roles. *Journal of Personality*, 62: 199–218.
- 36  
37 Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. 2008. Sociogenomic personality psychology. *Journal of*  
38 *Personality*, 76: 1523–1544.
- 39  
40 Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. 2007. The power of  
41 personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and  
42 cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological*  
43 *Science*, 2: 313–345.
- 44  
45 Roberts, B. W., Luo, J., Briley, D. A., Chow, P. I., Su, R., & Hill, P. L. 2017. A systematic  
46 review of personality trait change through intervention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143:  
47 117–141.
- 48  
49 Roberts, B. W., & Mroczek, D. 2008. Personality trait change in adulthood. *Current Directions*  
50 *in Psychological Science*, 17: 31–35.
- 51  
52 Roberts, B. W., & Nickel, L. B. 2017. A critical evaluation of the neo-socioanalytic model of  
53 personality. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality development across the lifespan*: 157–177.  
54 London: Academic Press.
- 55  
56 Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. 2006. Patterns of mean-level change in  
57 personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.  
58 *Psychological Bulletin*, 132: 1–25.
- 59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Roberts, B. W., & Wood, D. 2006. Personality development in the context of the neo-  
4 socioanalytic model of personality. In D. K. Mroczek & T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of*  
5 *personality development*: 11–39. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 6  
7 Roberts, B. W., Wood, D., & Caspi, A. 2008. The development of personality traits in adulthood.  
8 *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*: 3, 375–398.
- 9  
10 Roberts, L. M., Dutton, J. E., Spreitzer, G. M., Heaphy, E. D., & Quinn, R. E. 2005. Composing  
11 the reflected best-self portrait: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work  
12 organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30: 712–736.
- 13  
14 Rogers, C. R. 1947. Some observations on the organization of personality. *American*  
15 *Psychologist*, 2: 358–368.
- 16  
17 Rogers, C. R. 2007. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change.  
18 *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 3: 240–248.
- 19  
20 Rogers, C. R. 2012. *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Boston:  
21 Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- 22  
23 Rosenquist, J. N., Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. 2011. Social network determinants of  
24 depression. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 16: 273–281.
- 25  
26 Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., & Evans, D. E. 2000. Temperament and personality: Origins and  
27 outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78: 122–135.
- 28  
29 Rotter, J. B. 1954. *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-  
30 Hall.
- 31  
32 Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. 2013. Customer service behavior. *Handbook of Psychology*, 12:  
33 341–366.
- 34  
35 Sabelli, H. C., & Carlson-Sabelli, L. 1989. Biological priority and psychological supremacy: A  
36 new interrogative paradigm derived from process theory. *The American Journal of*  
37 *Psychiatry*, 146: 1541–1551.
- 38  
39 Sackett, P. R. 2002. The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and  
40 relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and*  
41 *Assessment*, 10: 5–11.
- 42  
43 Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and  
44 task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: 224–253.
- 45  
46 Sapir, E. 1934. The emergence of the concept of personality in a study of cultures. *Journal of*  
47 *Social Psychology*, 5: 408–415.
- 48  
49 Schmitt, N. 2014. Personality and cognitive ability as predictors of effective performance at  
50 work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1:  
51 45–65.
- 52  
53 Schneider, B., Smith, D. B., Taylor, S., & Fleenor, J. 1998. Personality and organizations: A test  
54 of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 462–  
55 470.
- 56  
57 Schult, J., & Sparfeldt, J. R. 2015. Compulsory military service and personality development.  
58 *SOEPpaper*, No. 751. Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2602703>
- 59  
60 Scollon, C. N., & Diener, E. 2006. Love, work, and changes in extraversion and neuroticism over  
time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91: 1152–1165.

- 1  
2  
3 Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2000. Positive psychology: An introduction.  
4 *American Psychologist*, 55: 5–14.
- 5  
6 Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L., & Blum, T. C. 2009. Interactive effects of growth need strength,  
7 work context, and job complexity on self-reported creative performance. *Academy of*  
8 *Management Journal*, 52: 489–505.
- 9  
10 Shoda, Y., Mischel, W., & Wright, J. C. 1994. Intraindividual stability in the organization and  
11 patterning of behavior: Incorporating psychological situations into the idiographic  
12 analysis of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67: 674–687.
- 13  
14 Smith, M. L., Glass, G. V., & Miller, T. I. 1980. *The benefits of psychotherapy*. Baltimore, MD:  
15 Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 16  
17 Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (Eds.). 2009. *Oxford handbook of positive psychology*. New York:  
18 Oxford University Press.
- 19  
20 Snyder, M. 1974. Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
21 *Psychology*, 30: 526–537.
- 22  
23 Soldz, S., & Vaillant, G. E. 1999. The Big Five personality traits and the life course: A 45-year  
24 longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33: 208–232.
- 25  
26 Soskin, D. P., Carl, J. R., Alpert, J., & Fava, M. 2012. Antidepressant effects on emotional  
27 temperament: Toward a biobehavioral research paradigm for major depressive disorder.  
28 *CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics*, 18: 441–451.
- 29  
30 Soto, C. 2016. Personality can change over a lifetime, and usually for the better. *Health News*  
31 *from National Public Radio*. Available at [http://www.npr.org/sections/health-](http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2016/06/30/484053435/personality-can-change-over-a-lifetime-and-usually-for-the-better)  
32 [shots/2016/06/30/484053435/personality-can-change-over-a-lifetime-and-usually-for-the-](http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2016/06/30/484053435/personality-can-change-over-a-lifetime-and-usually-for-the-better)  
33 [better](http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2016/06/30/484053435/personality-can-change-over-a-lifetime-and-usually-for-the-better) [accessed on July 5, 2016]
- 34  
35 Specht, J., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. 2011. Stability and change of personality across the life  
36 course: The impact of age and major life events on mean-level and rank-order stability of  
37 the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101: 862–882.
- 38  
39 Srivastava, S., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. 2003. Development of personality in early  
40 and middle adulthood: Set like plaster or persistent change? *Journal of Personality and*  
41 *Social Psychology*, 84: 1041–1053.
- 42  
43 Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. 1986. The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A  
44 lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 56–77.
- 45  
46 Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. 1985. Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job  
47 attitudes. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 70: 469–480.
- 48  
49 Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., & Terracciano, A. 2014. Physical activity and personality development  
50 across adulthood and old age: Evidence from two longitudinal studies. *Journal of*  
51 *Research in Personality*, 49: 1–7.
- 52  
53 Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., & Terracciano, A. 2015. How old do you feel? The role of age  
54 discrimination and biological aging in subjective age. *PloS One*, 10: e0119293.
- 55  
56 Stewart, A. J., & Deaux, K. 2012. Personality and social contexts as sources of change and  
57 continuity across the life span. In K. Deaux & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook*  
58 *of personality and social psychology*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Stewart, G. L., & Barrick, M. R. 2004. Four lessons learned from the person-situation debate: A  
4 review and research agenda. In D. B. Smith & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Personality and*  
5 *organizations*: 61–85. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Ltd.
- 6  
7 Stoll, G., & Trautwein, U. 2017. Vocational interests as personality traits: Characteristics,  
8 development, and significance in educational and organizational environments. In J.  
9 Specht (Ed.), *Personality development across the lifespan*: 401–417. London: Academic  
10 Press.
- 11  
12 Swann, W. B., & Read, S. J. 1981. Self-verification processes: How we sustain our self-  
13 conceptions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 17: 351–372.
- 14  
15 Tasselli, S., & Kilduff, M. 2017. When brokerage between friendship cliques endangers trust: A  
16 personality-network fit perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*. In press
- 17  
18 Tasselli, S., Kilduff, M., & Menges, J. I. 2015. The microfoundations of organizational social  
19 networks: A review and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 41:  
20 1361–1387.
- 21  
22 Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. 2003. A personality trait-based interactionist model of job  
23 performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 500–517.
- 24  
25 Thern, E., de Munter, J., Hemmingsson, T., & Rasmussen, F. 2017. Long-term effects of youth  
26 unemployment on mental health: Does an economic crisis make a difference? *Journal of*  
27 *Epidemiology and Community Health*. In press.
- 28  
29 Trice, H. M. 1962. *The job behavior of problem drinkers. Society, culture and drinking*  
30 *patterns*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- 31  
32 Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. 2001. Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired  
33 images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of*  
34 *Applied Psychology*, 86: 351–360.
- 35  
36 Vedres, B., & Stark, D. 2010. Structural folds: Generative disruption in overlapping  
37 groups. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115: 1150–1190.
- 38  
39 Wagner, J., Lüdtke, O., Jonkmann, K., & Trautwein, U. 2013. Cherish yourself: Longitudinal  
40 patterns and conditions of self-esteem change in the transition to young adulthood.  
41 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104: 148–163.
- 42  
43 Walker, B. M., & Winter, D. A. 2007. The elaboration of personal construct psychology. *Annual*  
44 *Review of Psychology*, 58: 453–477.
- 45  
46 Warner, W. L., & Lunt, P. S. 1941. *The social life of a modern community*. New Haven, CT:  
47 Yale University Press.
- 48  
49 Watson, D. 2002. Positive affectivity: The disposition to experience pleasurable emotional states.  
50 In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology*: 106–119.  
51 London: Oxford University Press.
- 52  
53 Watson, D., & Humrichouse, J. 2006. Personality development in emerging adulthood:  
54 Integrating evidence from self-ratings and spouse ratings. *Journal of Personality and*  
55 *Social Psychology*, 91: 959–974.
- 56  
57 Webb, G., Shakeshaft, A., Sanson Fisher, R., & Havard, A. 2009. A systematic review of  
58 work-place interventions for alcohol-related problems. *Addiction*, 104: 365–377.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Weiss, A., Bates, T. C., & Luciano, M. 2008. Happiness is a personal (ity) thing: The genetics of  
4 personality and well-being in a representative sample. *Psychological Science*, 19: 205–  
5 210.  
6  
7 West, M., Nicholson, N., & Arnold, J. 1987. Identity changes as outcomes of work-role  
8 transitions. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), *Self and identity: Perspectives across the*  
9 *lifespan*: 287–303. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.  
10  
11 Wiggins, J. S. 1991. Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding  
12 and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In D. Cicchetti & W. M. Grove (Eds.),  
13 *Thinking clearly about psychology: Essays in honor of Paul E. Meehl* (Vol. 1): 89–113.  
14 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
15  
16 Wille, B., Beyers, W., & De Fruyt, F. 2012. A transactional approach to person-environment fit:  
17 Reciprocal relations between personality development and career role growth across  
18 young to middle adulthood. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81: 307–321.  
19  
20 Wille, B., & De Fruyt, F. 2014. Vocations as a source of identity: Reciprocal relations between  
21 Big Five personality traits and RIASEC characteristics over 15 years. *Journal of Applied*  
22 *Psychology*, 99: 262–281.  
23  
24 Wilson, T. D. 2011. *Redirect: The surprising new science of psychological change*. New York:  
25 Little, Brown.  
26  
27 Winter, D. A., & Reed, N. (Eds.). 2015. *The Wiley handbook of personal construct psychology*.  
28 Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.  
29  
30 Winter, D. G. 2011. Philosopher-king or polarizing politician? A personality profile of Barack  
31 Obama. *Political Psychology*, 32: 1059–1081.  
32  
33 Wu, C. H. 2016. Personality change via work: A job demand-control model of Big Five  
34 personality changes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92: 157–166.  
35  
36 Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. 2012. Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe  
37 that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist*, 47: 302–314.  
38  
39 Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. 2011. Social-psychological interventions in education: They're  
40 not magic. *Review of Educational Research*, 81: 267–301.  
41  
42 Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. 2007. Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The  
43 impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33: 774–800.  
44  
45 Zaccaro, S. J. 2007. Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62: 6–16.  
46  
47 Zimmerman, R. D. 2008. Understanding the impact of personality traits on individuals' turnover  
48 decisions: A meta-analytic path model. *Personnel Psychology*, 61: 309–348.  
49  
50 Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J. 2013. Do we become a different person when hitting the road?  
51 Personality development of sojourners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
52 105: 515–530.  
53  
54 Zuroff, D. C. 1986. Was Gordon Allport a trait theorist? *Journal of Personality and Social*  
55 *Psychology*, 51: 993–1000.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 1.

## A Model of Antecedents and Outcomes of Personality Change

