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Definition of Personality

Major Elements

- Personality as traits (personality as temperament)
  - Stability over time (continuity)
  - Stability across situations (consistency)
  - Temperamental (genetic) basis
  - Focus on prediction and interactionism
- Mostly assumed in typological (FFM) research
  - Overwhelming focus of organizational psychologists
Definition of Personality

Major Elements

- Personality as states (personality in social context) that vary
  - Temporally
  - Contextually
    - Operate differently in different contexts
    - Only be meaningful considered in context
    - Personality is narrow, conditional, and contextualized
    - Focus on social and cognitive processes that govern behavior
We label these two perspectives

- **Trait**
  - Include biological (genetic), inventory (CPI, 16PF, GZTS), and FFM approaches

- **Social cognitive**
  - Includes social cognitive/learning (SCT, CAPS, RFT), need-based (SDT) and self-concept/regulatory (attachment theory) theories

Often researchers are one, not the other

- Hence The Cold War
Why do organizational personality psychologists tend to ignore context when what they study is a fundamental context?

Why do personologists – at least those who study context – tend to ignore one of the more fundamental contexts: work?
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Problem 1
Problem with *Personality Psychology*

- Adults 22-65 spend more hours working than any other activity other than sleep.
- Work is a major source of identity.
  - “Who are you?” *surnames in many languages*
  - “What do you do?”
- Work is also a major source of (dis)satisfaction.
- Yet, with some exceptions, personologists tend to ignore work context.
Organizational psychologists tend to study personality as traits

- More contextually-bound individual differences (e.g., self-efficacy, motivation) are not considered traits at all

So you see the paradox

- Personality psychologists who study contexts largely ignore work, and organizational psychologists study traits but not personality as expressed in a social context
My main point holds true even as one acknowledges...

**Exceptions:** Brent Roberts’ work on how work experiences shape personality development in adulthood

**Semantics:** Organizational psychologists do study motivations (e.g., self-efficacy, prosocial motivation), though they typically do not see these as aspects of personality
First let us briefly summarize support for these three approaches:

- Temperament perspective among personality psychologists
- Social cognitive perspective among personality psychologists
- Temperament perspective among organizational psychologists
Turkheimer’s First Law of Behavioral Genetics

- “Everything is genetic”
- Intelligence: 60-80% heritable
- Personality: 40-60% heritable
- But nearly any broad characteristic, behavior, or life outcome is heritable
## Heritability of Body Mass Index (BMI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Shared environment M</th>
<th>Shared environment F</th>
<th>Non-shared environment M</th>
<th>Non-shared environment F</th>
<th>Shared genes M</th>
<th>Shared genes F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hjelmborg et al. (2008)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,556 Finn twins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hur (2007)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888 Korean twins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schousbo et al. (2004)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Danish twins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Temperament Perspective

**Behavioral Genetics Study of Exercise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Genes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia (males)</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (females)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (males)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (females)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (males)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (females)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (males)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (females)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (males)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (females)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (males)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (females)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mischel and Peake’s (1982) argument:

- Our ability to predict specific behaviors is not impressive
- Our ability to predict broad classes of behavior is greater
- Our ability to predict behavior aggregated over time is greater
- The reason for the difference is that in the aggregates approach the situation has been factored out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single behaviors</th>
<th>Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal stability</strong></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-situation stability</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether you liked it or not, the first half of Mischel’s famed volume did not argue that cross-situational consistency in personality functioning is low. It argued that cross-situational consistency in personality functioning is low when one searches for consistency through the lens of global, nomothetic trait constructs. When one tries on different lenses, things clear up.

— Orom & Cervone (2009)
The field of personality has traditionally relied heavily on all-purpose measures of personal attributes in efforts to explain how personal factors contribute to psychosocial functioning.

In this “one fits all approach,” the items are decontextualized by deleting information about the situations with which people are dealing…

Given the highly conditional nature of human functioning, it is unrealistic to expect personality measures cast in nonconditional generalities to shed much light on the contribution of personal factors to psychosocial functioning in different task domains under diverse circumstances across all situations.

-- Bandura (1999)
Thus, there are still many in the field who insist on explaining context-driven socially problematic behavior in largely individualistic, trait-based terms, no matter how much evidence has been amassed to the contrary.

Extensive research on the “fundamental attribution error” demonstrates that the more troublesome or threatening the behavior, and the more extreme the actions with which they are concerned, the more tempting it is to attribute primary responsibility to disagreeable or damaged “others” whose bad acts are thought to be the products of their flawed characters. This can occur no matter how powerful the situations, settings, and structures to which the actors have been exposed and in which they have acted.

Recognizing the causal role of broad, destructive social forces in the genesis of socially problematic behavior implicates us all at a more direct and unsettling level than the dispositionalism with which it competes. It casts whatever tacit assent we may have extended to the social contextual status quo (e.g., prisons, poverty, or wars) in a very different light. Thus, our implicit support for the policies and practices that may have given rise to the damaging social contexts in question can be seen as part of the problem—a problem we may be expected to help solve.

— Haney and Zimbardo, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2009
For the most part, organizational psychologists follow the trait approach. They assume personality is:

- Quite stable
- Largely genetic in origin
- Best conceptualized by the five-factor model
- Productively assessed using self-reports
# Focus on Prediction
Spanning 50 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits (Childhood)</th>
<th>Intrinsic Career Success</th>
<th>Extrinsic Career Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick (Personnel Psychology, 1999)
We analyzed 594 Swedish twins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reared Together</th>
<th>Reared Apart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical (MZ)</td>
<td>134 (67 twin pairs)</td>
<td>94 (47 twin pairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal (DZ)</td>
<td>170 (85 twin pairs)</td>
<td>196 (98 twin pairs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed core self-evaluations ($\alpha=.76$), job satisfaction ($\alpha=.84$), work stress ($\alpha=.73$), and health problems ($\alpha=.71$).

First tested standard path model.

Focus on Genetic Effects
Judge, Ilies, & Zhang, 2012

- Core Self-Evaluations
- Job Satisfaction
- Work Stress
- Health Problems

Unstandardized coefficients:
- \( \beta = 0.24^{***} \)
- \( \beta = -0.07^{***} \)
- \( \beta = -0.39^{***} \)
- \( \beta = 0.64^{***} \)
- \( \beta = 1.05^{***} \)
Focus on Genetic Effects
Judge, Ilies, & Zhang, 2012

- A<sub>CSE</sub>
- A<sub>Med</sub>
- A<sub>Health</sub>
- E<sub>CSE</sub>
- E<sub>Med</sub>
- E<sub>Health</sub>

- Core Self-Evaluations
- Work Stress
- Health Problems

Genetic Variance
Observed Variance
Environment Variance
Partial correlations of constructs for Twin 1 and Twin 2 by zygosity

- Controlling for rearing (apart-together), amount/type of contact, age separated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identical (MZ)</th>
<th>Fraternal (DZ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core self-evaluations</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stress</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These studies are representative of the dominant trait perspective in organizational psychology which focuses on:

- Stability and genetic origins of traits
- Prediction (personality traits as independent variables predicting work criteria)

How can we integrate these perspectives in a way that is relevant to both personality and organizational psychology?

- One way is to study long-term change, but there is another means of studying change and context
Within-individual variation in experiences at work are partially responsible for within-individual variation in personality states.

What is within-individual variation in personality?

- Fleeson (2007) defined as “a dimension with the same content and scale as a personality trait but that assesses how the person is at the moment rather than how he or she is in general” (p. 826)
Variation in personality across situations or over time treated as measurement error (Mischel & Shoda, 1995)

However, consistent with the density distributions approach to personality (Fleeson, 2001; Fleeson & Jolley, 2006):

- Experiences at work can predict deviations from central tendencies in traits
- There are trait-relevant individual differences in responsiveness to work experiences
We have begun to study the effect of work on personality variation over very short time periods (micro temporal effects).

Funder: Interactionism (persons, situations, and behaviors) can take other forms beyond P x S:

- Lewin: $B = f(P, S)$
- Schneider: $S = f(P, B)$
- Our study: $P = f(B, S)$

Within-individual variation in work context will cause within-individual variation in personality.
Work Context
Judge, Hurst, Simon, & Kelley, under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Task Motivation</th>
<th>Social Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Intrinsic Work Motivation</td>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict at Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Goal-Setting Motivation</td>
<td>Prosocial Work Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Context</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial behavior at work (PSB)</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conflict (ICO)</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-setting motivation (GSM)</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation (IMO)</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Judge, Hurst, Simon, & Kelley, under review

- An experience-sampling (ESM) design was used
  - Participants were asked to complete a survey each day that they attended work. Links to the surveys were emailed daily; surveys were available only from 3:00PM to 11:00PM
- Daily surveys contained measures of personality and the work variables
- Of the 150 individuals invited to participate in the study, 129 (86%) started the study
- Usable data were available for 122 participants (81.3%). Out of a maximum 1,220 observations for each study variable (122 × 10), 1,081 were provided (86.3%)
Dataset was constructed so that both personality and work variables were used to predict next day level of these variables.

Specification also included (estimated links):
- Autoregressive effects (day-to-day)
- Day effects (constructs assessed on common day)
- General trait factor also was created to control for trait (between person) effects
- Within-week equality constraints imposed
  - No reason to believe T→W different from W→TH
Model Specification

Prosocial Behavior at Work – Agreeableness

Causal effects of Prosocial Work Behavior on next-day Agreeableness

Week 1

Monday

PSB_1

AGR_1

Tuesday

PSB_2

AGR_2

Wednesday

PSB_3

AGR_3

Thursday

PSB_4

AGR_4

Friday

PSB_5

AGR_5

Week 2

Monday

PSB_6

AGR_6

Tuesday

PSB_7

AGR_7

Wednesday

PSB_8

AGR_8

Thursday

PSB_9

AGR_9

Friday

PSB_{10}

AGR_{10}

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; AGR – Agreeableness
Model Specification
Prosocial Behavior at Work – Agreeableness

Week 1
Monday
PSB₁
AGR₁

Tuesday
PSB₂
AGR₂

Wednesday
PSB₃
AGR₃

Thursday
PSB₄
AGR₄

Friday
PSB₅
AGR₅

Week 2
Monday
PSB₆
AGR₆

Tuesday
PSB₇
AGR₇

Wednesday
PSB₈
AGR₈

Thursday
PSB₉
AGR₉

Friday
PSB₁₀
AGR₁₀

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; AGR – Agreeableness
Within week

These effects should be the same as other days of the week: M→T; T→W; W→TH; and TH→F should be equal for both weeks

The Friday to Monday effects should be weaker due to:
1. 3-day lag
2. Weekend (non-work) events

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; AGR – Agreeableness
Model Specification
Prosocial Behavior at Work – Conscientiousness

Week 1

Monday
PSB\textsubscript{1}
CON\textsubscript{1}

Tuesday
PSB\textsubscript{2}
CON\textsubscript{2}

Wednesday
PSB\textsubscript{3}
CON\textsubscript{3}

Thursday
PSB\textsubscript{4}
CON\textsubscript{4}

Friday
PSB\textsubscript{5}
CON\textsubscript{5}

Week 2

Monday
PSB\textsubscript{6}
CON\textsubscript{6}

Tuesday
PSB\textsubscript{7}
CON\textsubscript{7}

Wednesday
PSB\textsubscript{8}
CON\textsubscript{8}

Thursday
PSB\textsubscript{9}
CON\textsubscript{9}

Friday
PSB\textsubscript{10}
CON\textsubscript{10}

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; CON – Conscientiousness
Model Specification

Prosocial Behavior at Work – Conscientiousness

Week 1

Monday
PSB₁
CON₁

Tuesday
PSB₂
CON₂

Wednesday
PSB₃
CON₃

Thursday
PSB₄
CON₄

Friday
PSB₅
CON₅

Week 2

Monday
PSB₆
CON₆

Tuesday
PSB₇
CON₇

Wednesday
PSB₈
CON₈

Thursday
PSB₉
CON₉

Friday
PSB₁₀
CON₁₀

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; CON – Conscientiousness
### Model Specification

#### Weekend Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>PSB</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>PSB₄</td>
<td>CON₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>PSB₅</td>
<td>CON₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>PSB₆</td>
<td>CON₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>PSB₇</td>
<td>CON₇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Within week**

These effects should be the same as other days of the week: M→T; T→W; W→TH; and TH→F should be equal for both weeks.

**Weekend**

The Friday to Monday effects should be weaker due to:

1. 3-day lag
2. Weekend (non-work) events

*PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; CON – Conscientiousness*
Model Specification

Prosocial Behavior at Work – Extraversion

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; EXT – Extraversion
Model Specification
Prosocial Behavior at Work – Openness

Monday
PSB₁
OPE₁

Tuesday
PSB₂
OPE₂

Wednesday
PSB₃
OPE₃

Thursday
PSB₄
OPE₄

Friday
PSB₅
OPE₅

Week 1

Monday
PSB₆
OPE₆

Tuesday
PSB₇
OPE₇

Wednesday
PSB₈
OPE₈

Thursday
PSB₉
OPE₉

Friday
PSB₁₀
OPE₁₀

Week 2

PSB – Prosocial Behavior at Work; OPE – Openness
Model Specification
Conflict at Work – Agreeableness

ICO – Interpersonal Conflict at Work; AGR – Agreeableness
Model Specification
Conflict at Work – Extraversion

ICO – Interpersonal Conflict at Work; EXT – Extraversion

Week 1
Monday
ICO1 – EXT1
Tuesday
ICO2 – EXT2
Wednesday
ICO3 – EXT3
Thursday
ICO4 – EXT4
Friday
ICO5 – EXT5

Week 2
Monday
ICO6 – EXT6
Tuesday
ICO7 – EXT7
Wednesday
ICO8 – EXT8
Thursday
ICO9 – EXT9
Friday
ICO10 – EXT10

Monday
Tuesday
Wednesday
Thursday
Friday
Model Specification
Conflict at Work – Neuroticism

ICO – Interpersonal Conflict at Work; NEU – Neuroticism

ICO1, ICO3, ICO5, ICO7, ICO9, ICO10
NEU1, NEU3, NEU5, NEU7, NEU9, NEU10

Week 1
Monday: ICO1, NEU1
Tuesday: ICO2, NEU2
Wednesday: ICO3, NEU3
Thursday: ICO4, NEU4
Friday: ICO5, NEU5

Week 2
Monday: ICO6, NEU6
Tuesday: ICO7, NEU7
Wednesday: ICO8, NEU8
Thursday: ICO9, NEU9
Friday: ICO10, NEU10

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday
Model Specification
Goal-Setting Motivation – Conscientiousness

GSM – Goal-Setting Motivation; CON – Conscientiousness
IMO – Intrinsic Work Motivation; AGR – Agreeableness
Model Specification

Intrinsic Work Motivation – Conscientiousness

IMO – Intrinsic Work Motivation; CON – Conscientiousness
Model Specification
Intrinsic Work Motivation – Openness

IMO – Intrinsic Work Motivation; OPE – Openness
## Results

### Is There Within-Individual Variation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance decomposition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>49.38%</td>
<td>50.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>53.47%</td>
<td>46.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>44.06%</td>
<td>55.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>53.67%</td>
<td>46.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>61.97%</td>
<td>38.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average personality trait</strong></td>
<td>52.51%</td>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conflict at work (ICO)</td>
<td>42.42%</td>
<td>57.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial behavior at work (PSB)</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
<td>48.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-setting motivation (GSM)</td>
<td>45.91%</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic work motivation (IMO)</td>
<td>49.39%</td>
<td>50.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average work variable</strong></td>
<td>47.41%</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Results
Prosocial Behavior at Work (PSB)

PSB→Agreeableness
- Weekday 1
  - PSB₁
  - AGR₁
  - Weekday 2
    - PSB₂
    - AGR₂
  - Coefficient: 0.256**
  - Coefficient: 0.179**
  - Coefficient: 0.078
  - Coefficient: 0.015

PSB→Conscientiousness
- Weekday 1
  - PSB₁
  - CON₁
  - Weekday 2
    - PSB₂
    - CON₂
  - Coefficient: 0.259**
  - Coefficient: 0.127**
  - Coefficient: 0.019
  - Coefficient: 0.197**

PSB→Extraversion
- Weekday 1
  - PSB₁
  - EXT₁
  - Weekday 2
    - PSB₂
    - EXT₂
  - Coefficient: 0.246**
  - Coefficient: 0.147**
  - Coefficient: 0.070
  - Coefficient: 0.057

PSB→Openness
- Weekday 1
  - PSB₁
  - OPE₁
  - Weekday 2
    - PSB₂
    - OPE₂
  - Coefficient: 0.235**
  - Coefficient: 0.119**
  - Coefficient: 0.004
  - Coefficient: 0.147**
  - Coefficient: 0.070
  - Coefficient: 0.057

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized. * p<.05, ** p<.01.
## Summary of Results

**Work Conflict (ICO)**

**Goal-Setting Motivation (GSM)**

### ICO → Agreeableness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday 1</th>
<th>Weekday 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>AGR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICO<sub>1</sub> → ICO<sub>2</sub>: 0.178***

AGR<sub>1</sub> → AGR<sub>2</sub>: 0.138***

### GSM → Conscientiousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday 1</th>
<th>Weekday 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>GSM&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>CON&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GSM<sub>1</sub> → GSM<sub>2</sub>: 0.207***

CON<sub>1</sub> → CON<sub>2</sub>: 0.213***

### ICO → Extraversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday 1</th>
<th>Weekday 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>EXT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICO<sub>1</sub> → ICO<sub>2</sub>: 0.186***

EXT<sub>1</sub> → EXT<sub>2</sub>: 0.090*

### ICO → Neuroticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday 1</th>
<th>Weekday 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ICO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>NEU&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICO<sub>1</sub> → ICO<sub>2</sub>: 0.198***

NEU<sub>1</sub> → NEU<sub>2</sub>: 0.224***

---

**Note:** Coefficients are unstandardized. * p < .05, ** p < .01.
Summary of Results
Intrinsic Motivation (IMO)

IMO → Agreeableness

Weekday 1
IMO₁

Weekday 2
IMO₂

AGR₁

AGR₂

0.165**

-0.005

0.131***

0.052*

IMO → Conscientiousness

Weekday 1
IMO₁

Weekday 2
IMO₂

CON₁

CON₂

0.168**

0.015

0.074*

0.217**

IMO → Openness

Weekday 1
IMO₁

Weekday 2
IMO₁

OPE₁

OPE₁

0.124**

0.134*

0.053*

0.199**

As we’ll see on the next slides, the degree to which work experiences predicted next-day personality states varied according to individuals’ trait Neuroticism (as assessed by a significant other).

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized. * p < .05, ** p < .01.
Interactions
Conflict → Agreeableness by Trait (Neuroticism)

Experiencing Interpersonal Conflict at work on Day 1 decreases next-day Agreeableness more for Neurotic individuals.
Interactions
Conflict→Openness by Trait (Neuroticism)

Experiencing Interpersonal Conflict at work on Day 1 decreases next-day Openness for Neurotic individuals but increases Openness for the Emotionally Stable individuals.

Trait Neuroticism
- High Trait N
- Low Trait N

Next Day Openness (Z-score)

Low

High

Daily Interpersonal Conflict at Work
Personality has much within-individual variation.

This is not merely transient error; it was predicted by work context.

More work → personality (9/11) than personality → work effects (4/11) were significant.

- In 1 case, only p → w significant
- In 1 case, neither w → p nor p → w significant
- Remember, these are within-individual relationships

Within-week effects much stronger than cross-week (weekend in-between) effects.
Strengths and Limitations
Judge, Hurst, Simon, & Kelley, under review

- Rigorous specification controlled for
  - Autocorrelated (day-to-day) errors
  - Within-day correlations
  - Simultaneous estimation of both directions of causality
  - Trait (between-individual personality) effects
- Results also revealed that the work → personality “state” affects depended on trait (neuroticism)
- Mediating processes remain to be seen
  - Mood a likely candidate
Conclusions?

Between-Individuals Long-term

Personality ➔ Work Context

Within-Individuals Shorter-term

Work Context ➔ Personality
Questions

- Have organizational psychologists over-emphasized the traitedness of personality?
- Have personality psychologists under-emphasized work as a primary context in which personality develops and is expressed?
- What explains effects of work on personality?
  - Affect? Cognitions? Attributions?
- Do state and trait interact?
- What happens in the weekend that “washes out” within-week effects?
In the classical psychometric conception of behavioral dispositions, the individual’s “true score” on the behavioral dimension, relative to normative levels in each situation, should remain constant. The deviations from the true score observed in each situation are assumed to reflect measurement noise or random fluctuation. But if patterns … directly contradict this classic assumption, and reveal a second type of within-person consistency that needs to be assessed and explained. The two types of variability coexist as two aspects of the expressions of coherence. Each is important and informative: The need is for a theory of personality that accounts for and predicts both of them.

Social cognitive theory does not cede the construct of “disposition” to trait theory
Dynamic dispositions must be distinguished from static trait dispositions
However, isn’t this a false choice?
- Traits, when measured well, do generalize across situations and over time
- Personality does reflect the contexts in which it operates
What to do

Work climate and events matter
- On a within-person basis, people can move from the specific (a work motivation, behavior, or event) to the general (one’s general predispositions), even within a short term process

Fit/adapt the person to the job
- Some people are more reactive to this cycle than are others

Long-term implications?
- Is this nihilistic? Are there virtuous/viscous spirals?
Thank You!

For copies of slides/papers, visit…

www.timothy-judge.com
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