



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
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
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
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
5 *change* refers to change in the individual’s characteristic pattern of thought, emotion, or behavior
6
7
8 as well as change to the mechanisms behind these patterns.
9

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

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

44 **Brief History**

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

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
5 Priesemuth & Taylor, 2016), guided self-help is effective in fostering positive change (see
6
7 Cuijpers, Donker, van Straten, Li, & Andersson, 2010, for a meta-analysis). And as people move
8
9 into new roles in organizations, they experiment with provisional selves that serve as trials for
10
11 possible but not yet fully elaborated professional identities (Ibarra, 1999) that can incorporate
12
13 personality traits activated by the new work contexts (e.g., Judge & Zapata, 2015).
14
15

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

42 ***State or trait change?*** As extensive evidence has accumulated over the last decades on the
43
44 possibility of personality change following individuals' self-development interventions (Rogers,
45
46 2007), two opposing perspectives have emerged concerning whether such personality changes
47
48 capture *state* or *trait* variance. The first position argues that changes in personality observed
49
50 during therapy are attributable to (relatively transient) state-level variance rather than (relatively
51
52 enduring) trait-level variance (e.g., Du, Bakish, Ravindran, & Hrdina, 2002). From this
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 attributes can include emotional intelligence, cognitive skills, and flexibility. And leadership
5 research investigates whether latent leadership traits, including charisma, are socially discovered
6 and manifested in given social situations. For example, a recent study reinterpreting charismatic
7 leadership from a network personality perspective analyzed whether leaders who occupied
8 positions of centrality in team advice networks exhibited emergent charisma over time or
9 whether charismatic leaders went on to occupy central network positions (Balkundi et al., 2011).
10 Results showed that leaders' centrality preceded the emergence of leader charisma. There is also
11 growing interest in understanding whether and how charisma can spread from leaders to
12 followers in organizational settings: Followers tend to imitate charismatic leaders' non-verbal
13 behavior, enhancing in turn the expression of their personal charisma (Cherulnik et al., 2001).

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

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

Personality-job fit. According to existing approaches to personality-job fit, people with specific attributes and traits are considered suitable to occupy specific roles in organizations (e.g., Judge et al., 2002b). In contrast, sociologists suggest that actors' occupation of positions in social and organizational systems elicit specific role behaviors. In this sense, social structures and processes "vastly transcend the individual consciousness of actors" (Lorrain & White, 1971: 50). Personality, from a sociological view, is a set of characteristics granted by others. Each person develops a social personality that derives from occupation of "a particular place in the social space of a given society" (Warner & Lunt, 1941: 26). Recent research in this domain

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

23
24
25 ***Task design.*** Not everyone may be equally capable of personality change within the
26 context of fit with job roles. In task design research, there has been consistent interest in growth
27 need strength, which represents the individual's desire to grow and develop within the job role
28 (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Pindek, Kessler, & Spector, 2017). Research shows that people with
29 high growth need strength respond to supportive work contexts with more creative performance

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

54 **Broadening and Deepening the Scope of Theory and Measurement**

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

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*
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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 Reger, R. K., Gustafson, L. T., Demarie, S. M., & Mullane, J. V. 1994. Reframing the
19 organization: Why implementing total quality is easier said than done. *Academy of*
20 *Management Review*, 19: 565–584.
- 22 Robbins, B. D. 2008. What is the good life? Positive psychology and the renaissance of
23 humanistic psychology. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 36: 96–112.
- 24 Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. 2017. *Organizational behavior*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- 26 Roberts, B. W. 1997. Plaster or plasticity: Are work experiences associated with personality
27 change in women? *Journal of Personality*, 65: 205–232.
- 28 Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. 2003. Work experiences and personality development
29 in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84: 582–593.
- 31 Roberts, B. W., & Donahue, E. M. 1994. One personality, multiple selves: Integrating
32 personality and social roles. *Journal of Personality*, 62: 199–218.
- 33 Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. 2008. Sociogenomic personality psychology. *Journal of*
34 *Personality*, 76: 1523–1544.
- 36 Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. 2007. The power of
37 personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and
38 cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological*
39 *Science*, 2: 313–345.
- 41 Roberts, B. W., Luo, J., Briley, D. A., Chow, P. I., Su, R., & Hill, P. L. 2017. A systematic
42 review of personality trait change through intervention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143:
43 117–141.
- 44 Roberts, B. W., & Mroczek, D. 2008. Personality trait change in adulthood. *Current Directions*
45 *in Psychological Science*, 17: 31–35.
- 47 Roberts, B. W., & Nickel, L. B. 2017. A critical evaluation of the neo-socioanalytic model of
48 personality. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality development across the lifespan*: 157–177.
49 London: Academic Press.
- 51 Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. 2006. Patterns of mean-level change in
52 personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.
53 *Psychological Bulletin*, 132: 1–25.
- 54
55
56
57
58
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

