An integrative approach to more nuanced estimates of personality-job-performance relations

Andreas Wihler¹ | Gerhard Blickle² | Christian Ewen² | Hanna Genau² | Sonja Fritze² | Lena Völkl² | Roxanne Merkl² | Tamara Missfeld² | Melanie Mützel²

¹University of Exeter Business School, Exeter, UK ²University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

Correspondence

Andreas Wihler, University of Exeter Business School, Rennes Drive, Exeter EX4 4PU, UK. Email: a.wihler@exeter.ac.uk

Abstract

Recent research has suggested that self- and otherratings of personality may provide different information about personality, which can be captured in the trait-reputation-identity (TRI) model. Based on the TRI model, we investigate the link between personality and aligned job performance criteria on domain and aspect levels of the Big Five personality traits. In five samples (overall N = 571 triplets of target self-ratings and two coworker other-ratings), we investigated the relationships between the shared information on personality and shared information about job performance. We found that all personality domains showed substantial criterion validity in predicting the corresponding job-performance dimensions. Furthermore, we found stronger estimates for aspects of agreeableness and openness. We discuss theoretical and practical implications for target replacement and performance management.

KEYWORDS

aspects of personality, construct correspondence, job performance, trait-reputation-identity model

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

^{© 2022} The Authors. Applied Psychology published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of International Association of Applied Psychology.

APPLIED

PSYCHOLOGY

The role of personality in predicting job performance in recruitment contexts has been a long story of ups and downs (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997; Tett et al., 2006). More recently, however, research has shown that other-rated personality is substantially related to job performance (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011). In contrast, other theoretical perspectives argue that both self- and other-ratings have merit. Based on self-other knowledge asymmetries (Luft & Ingham, 1955; Vazire, 2010), it appears that certain kinds of information can be easily observed by others, whereas other kinds of information are almost entirely hidden from the outside world and can be observed only by the target individual.

Given the mixed findings with regard to the utility of self-rated personality, and the growing interest in understanding how self-ratings converge with other-ratings (Connelly et al., 2021; Connelly & Ones, 2010; McAbee & Connelly, 2016; Vergauwe et al., 2022), this study combines several previous approaches into a novel approach that can shed more light on how converged self- and other-ratings of personality affect converged self- and other-ratings of performance. Applying theoretical perspectives on self-other knowledge asymmetry, we investigate the magnitude of associations between personality traits and job-performance dimensions, with the aim of resolving the lack of clarity regarding the role of personality in job performance, there is also considerable overlap between personality ratings by oneself and others (Connelly & Ones, 2010). This inconsistency in predictive value suggests that knowledge asymmetry (Vazire, 2010) may actually provide meaningful insights into the interplay of self- and other-ratings that has been largely neglected by previous research focusing on either self-ratings (Barrick et al., 2001) or other-ratings (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011).

Acknowledging these differences, a new theoretical model was proposed (McAbee & Connelly, 2016): the trait-reputation-identity (TRI) model of personality. The TRI model builds on previous findings on the criterion validity of self- and other-ratings of personality and incorporates research on information asymmetry. Thus, in this model, both self- and other-ratings of personality are considered important sources of information. The TRI model separates self-other trait ratings into consensus about underlying traits (trait), unique self-perceptions (identity), and impressions shared by others that are distinct from the self (reputation). More recently, Connelly et al. (2021) put the TRI model to a first test, but focused only on variance decomposition of personality.

Before the idea of the TRI emerged, a similar approach has already been applied to the study of job performance ratings (Hoffman et al., 2010). Accordingly, the common variance in jobperformance ratings from multiple sources shares only a small amount of variance with actual performance. The remaining variance is distributed between either specific source or rater factors. However, these authors did not model the common variance shared by all other-raters, that is, raters' shared performance assessment above and beyond targets' performance assessments. Consequently, in our research, we apply the TRI model of personality (McAbee & Connelly, 2016) in combination with an equivalent approach for job performance (the arenablind spot-façade [ABF] model), labeling it the TRI-ABF model, in five samples (one for each personality trait) to contribute to a better understanding of the role of personality in the prediction of job performance. The overall model and its differences to other models are depicted in Figure 1. We therefore go beyond previous work applying TRI, and we acknowledge that not only personality (Connelly et al., 2021) but also performance (Hoffman et al., 2010) consists of



FIGURE 1 Conceptual models. Notes: Conceptual models for (a) two correlated general factors, (b) two correlated factors with uncorrelated source factors, and (c) the TRI-personality-ABF-performance models. a, other-ratings A; b, other-ratings B; j, job-performance-based indicators; p, personality-based indicators; s, self-ratings; *^{+#±¤}respective factor loadings have been set to be equal

both shared and rater-specific information (variance). Furthermore, we aim at better aligning the level of analysis between personality and performance by not only focusing on broad personality traits (Connelly et al., 2021) but also on aspects of personality (DeYoung et al., 2007),

. . .

personality information that comprises specific personality trait facets, but is grouped below the broad personality traits. Recent research (e.g., Blickle et al., 2015; Wihler et al., 2017; Wilmot et al., 2019) has already demonstrated that personality aspects can have superior predictive validities.

In sum, the relationship between personality and job performance is equivocal in the literature, and using the TRI-ABF approach offers a novel explanation for the mixed findings.

Consequently, our research makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, we extend our knowledge about the relations between personality and performance. Previous research has investigated these relations in a piecemeal approach: Barrick et al. (2001) investigated the relations between self-ratings of *domain* traits and *specific* job performance criteria, whereas Connelly and Ones (2010) studied relations between other-ratings of *domain* traits and overall job performance. Other researchers investigated the incremental effects of other-ratings of domain personality above self-ratings (Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011) on overall job performance or investigated self-ratings of aspect-level personality traits and their relations with overall job performance (Judge et al., 2013). In contrast, others have studied the personality-job-performance relation by utilizing self-ratings of *aspect* personality traits and specific performance criteria (Hogan & Holland, 2003).

With our work, we synthesize these research efforts and move beyond them in notable ways: Instead of looking at self-ratings in an isolated fashion or incremental effects, we investigate the *joint* effect of self- and other-ratings of *aspect*-level personality traits on *specific* job performance criteria. By acknowledging the existence of shared information, idiosyncratic perspectives, and information asymmetries, the TRI–ABF model is able to take potential rater distortions into account. Consequently, we are able to estimate criterion validity when ratings of domains and aspects of each Big Five personality trait are used to predict job performance in a more nuanced way than before. Thus, we provide a clearer picture of the magnitudes of the relations between specific job-performance dimensions and personality traits based on shared information across several raters.

Second, we show that utilizing the TRI-ABF model results in a reduction in the error variance that usually creates noise and masks potential criterion-relevant effects (Cote & Buckley, 1987). By investigating ratings of three individuals (between raters) while holding constant all individual characteristics (within raters), our approach leads to a reduction in error variance. It thus helps accurately uncover the strength of personality traits for predicting job performance. Whereas meta-analyses correct for sampling error, unreliability, and range restriction, our approach allowed us to more precisely estimate criterion validity by holding raters constant within personality and performance ratings while simultaneously eliminating common source variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). By using the information that is shared *between* multiple raters, we are able to disentangle construct and artificial variance from each other.

Finally, to answer calls for researchers to consider construct correspondence (Hogan & Holland, 2003; Judge et al., 2013), we investigated four different performance dimensions and 10 aspects of personality in five samples (DeYoung et al., 2007). By doing so, we covered a wide range of job-performance dimensions that are important for a broad range of jobs while also testing the generalizability of our theoretical model. To date, our research represents the most elaborated overview of the relations between personality traits and job-performance dimensions while relying on multiple raters and accounting for rater-specific noise.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The role of personality in predicting job performance

One of the most broadly used taxonomies of personality in research is the five-factor model (Costa & McCrae, 1992). More recently, DeYoung et al. (2007) introduced an improved framework for personality by using a combination of psychometric and genetic approaches. With their research, DeYoung et al. developed a lower order trait taxonomy (see also Figure 1), which grouped subdimensions into two aspects of personality for each trait. In this taxonomy (following Judge et al., 2013), conscientiousness consists of industriousness (covering the facets achievement striving, competence, and self-discipline) and orderliness (deliberation, dutifulness, and order). Agreeableness is split into compassion (tender-mindedness, altruism, and trust) and politeness (compliance, modesty, and straightforwardness). For extraversion, DeYoung et al. labeled the aspects enthusiasm (gregariousness, positive emotions, warmth, and excitement-seeking) and assertiveness (activity, assertiveness, and excitementseeking). Thus, in this taxonomy, the NEO excitement-seeking facet was part of both aspects. Later research (e.g., Wilmot et al., 2019) grouped assertiveness and activity as a single aspect, which they termed social potency. In our study, we follow the latter approach and grouped excitement-seeking only with enthusiasm but not with social potency. For neuroticism, DeYoung et al. (2007) identified the aspects volatility (angry hostility and impulsiveness) and withdrawal (anxiety, depression, self-consciousness, and vulnerability). And finally, openness consisted of the aspects of intellect (ideas) and aesthetic openness (actions, aesthetics, fantasy, feeling, and values).

To our knowledge, the application of the aspect model of personality, however, is still in a nascent status in the work context. Since the presentation of DeYoung et al.'s (2007) model of personality, only one comprehensive study has used this taxonomy in the work context (i.e., Judge et al., 2013). To date, researchers in this area have predominantly investigated the role of personality at work on the domain level, thereby neglecting the potential for higher predictor–criteria correspondence. For example, a second-order meta-analysis (Barrick et al., 2001) concluded that self-rated conscientiousness was the only consistent and generalizable predictor across performance dimensions and occupations, with neuroticism (or emotional stability) being the second-best predictor of work performance. Later meta-analyses found other-ratings of personality to have nine times higher coefficients than self-ratings (Onnelly & Ones, 2010) and thus to have incremental validity above and beyond self-ratings (Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011).

Hence, it appears reasonable to conclude that the use of other-ratings of personality can increase validity coefficients. More recently, however, research has shown that not only can self-ratings of personality be distorted, but observer-ratings can as well, although to a smaller extent than self-ratings (König et al., 2017). Thus, in our view, a better integration of self- and other-ratings of personality, instead of relying on only one source of information, may advance future research on the relations between personality and job performance.

The TRI model

Recently introduced, one such integration is the TRI model, which builds on multiple perspectives on personality such as the Johari window (Luft & Ingham, 1955), the socioanalytic . . .

theory of personality (Hogan & Blickle, 2013), the self-other knowledge asymmetry model (Vazire, 2010), and bifactor models (Reise, 2012) with multisource data. In bifactor models, the correlations between items are first attributed to a general factor that accounts for the shared variance across all the items and second to group factors that capture incremental variance over the general factors shared among the groups of items. Furthermore, all factors in bifactor models are assumed to be orthogonal (Rodriguez et al., 2016). For the TRI model, the general factor represents the variance shared across all the items from self- and other-ratings, labeled the *trait* factor. In addition, the TRI model consists of three factor groups: Self-perceptions that are unique to oneself are captured by the *identity* factor, whereas the *reputation* factor accounts for the shared other-perceptions, which are distinct from self-perceptions. Finally, the *observer uniqueness* factor represents unique information specific to each observer (McAbee & Connelly, 2016). Thus, the TRI model provides a promising analytical framework that allows for the decomposition of personality trait variance into parts shared by all raters, idiosyncratic self-perceptions, other-shared variance, and other-rater-specific variance.

Initial results (McAbee & Connelly, 2016) showed that the factor structure of the TRI model is superior to a general factor model. In addition, an initial application of an earlier version of the TRI in the academic context (Kholin et al., 2016) showed its utility and the validity of results for predicting objective academic achievement based on the personality trait of openness to experience. More recently, Connelly et al. (2021) investigated the relative validities of the TRI factors on dimensions of job performance (i.e., task performance, organizational citizenship behavior directed at individuals [OCB-I] and at the organization [OCB-O], and GPA). Their findings show that the trait factor was only related to outcomes in four out of 20 estimated relationships, whereas the reputation factor showed the most consistent patterns (13 out of 20 relationships).

In addition, the TRI model was applied to the study of individual differences in motivation (Blickle et al., 2018). These authors investigated the effect of shared perceptions of the motivation to act politically (i.e., self-serving political will; Treadway, 2012) on career success. Results revealed that the trait factor was positively correlated with career success, whereas the identity and reputation factors (as well as bivariate correlations) were not. Thus, the TRI model revealed a substantial relation between political will and career performance, otherwise masked by source effects.

Bifactor models for job-performance ratings

Whereas the application of bifactor models in personality research is more or less just beginning, similar approaches for understanding job-performance ratings were advanced earlier. Although initial meta-analytic evidence pointed toward the existence of a general performance factor across multiple raters (Viswesvaran et al., 2005), later analyses applying bifactor models (Hoffman et al., 2010) revealed that multisource performance ratings are largely affected by rater source effects. Analyzing data with reference to multiple source performance ratings (MSPR) in two samples, Hoffman et al. (2010) assessed the share of different performance dimensions, general job performance, and idiosyncratic and source-specific effects of self-, supervisor-, peer-, and subordinate-ratings. Results revealed a somewhat discouraging pattern (Hoffman et al., 2010): Whereas performance dimensions and general job performance accounted for only a small amount of the variance (3%–8%), the greater share of variance was captured by idiosyncratic rater effects (62%) followed by source factors (19%). These results indicate that source factors largely drive both self- and other-ratings of job performance and that relying on individual ratings (either self or other) may lead to distorted findings.

Thus, because it is not only personality ratings that depend on raters with a sometimes unique perspective, but performance ratings do as well, we decided to utilize an extension of the TRI model, namely, the arena, blind spot, and façade (ABF) model. Whereas the *arena* factor is comparable with the trait factor in the TRI in capturing the variance shared across performance ratings, the blind spot captures the view shared by other-raters on performance (like the reputation factor). Finally, the façade factor is comparable with the identity factor and accounts for the unique performance perceptions of self-raters. By decomposing performance ratings in the ABF model, we are able to account for rater-specific effects that could potentially distort performance ratings while also capturing the variance shared across all raters, which reflects common perceptions of job performance across raters (Hoffman et al., 2010).

Construct correspondence

To increase the validity of self-ratings of personality, researchers (Hough, 1992; Judge et al., 2013; Tett & Christiansen, 2007) have advocated the use of narrow personality traits as well as an alignment of predictor and criterion (Campbell, 1990; Hogan & Holland, 2003): construct correspondence. Here, the goal is to measure the predictor and criterion at the same level of specificity. Moreover, the authors caution against using general traits to predict specific behaviors or vice versa because the lack of correspondence would lead to nonsignificant findings.

Empirical evidence for the positive effects of construct correspondence was provided by Hogan and Holland (2003). In their meta-analysis, the authors not only chose more narrow conceptualizations of extraversion and openness (resulting in seven personality factors; Hogan & Hogan, 1992), but they also used performance dimensions matched for each personality trait. Their results showed that the alignment of self-ratings of personality with corresponding criteria can increase predictive validity coefficients and provide a useful perspective on validity estimations. Relatedly, this might also explain why previous research (Connelly et al., 2021) did not reveal strong validities for the trait factor of personality. Broad domain factors might, in fact, be too broad to explain variance in specific performance outcomes.

Combining DeYoung et al.'s (2007) taxonomy with the concept of construct correspondence, Judge et al. (2013) compared the validity of self-ratings of the NEO facets, aspects, and trait domains (broad traits) in predicting general job performance as well as the performance dimensions. Despite the small effect sizes they found, their results showed that more narrow conceptualizations of personality were better in predicting job performance, especially specific job-performance dimensions. Furthermore, they concluded that trait domains "obscure too many facet-level differences to provide optimal estimates" (p. 891). Thus, the authors advocated applying the DeYoung et al. aspects model of personality to construct correspondence.

In sum, by combining self- and other-raters of personality and performance, we can overcome the information knowledge asymmetry (Vazire, 2010) and use all available information for predicting performance. Furthermore, by focusing on aspects of personality (DeYoung et al., 2007), we provide better alignment between predictor and criteria, overcoming the issue of too narrow personality facets (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000) or too broad personality traits (Connelly et al., 2021; Judge et al., 2013).

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Based on the elaborations summarized above, our research represents a synthesis of advancements in personality research (i.e., the TRI model) and considerations concerning construct correspondence (Campbell, 1990) and predictor–criterion specificity (Cronbach & Gleser, 1965). In the following, we review prototypical performance criteria selected for each trait and the nature of the relations we expected between this performance dimension and its corresponding personality aspects (see Figure 2).

DeYoung et al. (2007) provided an elaborate taxonomy of 10 aspects (two per personality domain) that have offered increases in validity coefficients (over the broader domain) when predicting specific job-performance dimensions (Judge et al., 2013). Building on these previous findings, we expected that the validity coefficients for each combination of personality trait and job-performance dimension would increase when evaluated at the aspect levels.

Although conscientiousness is the best predictor of work-related performance in general (Barrick et al., 2001), theoretically, it has been claimed that conscientiousness best predicts contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Thus, we focused on job dedication (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) as one facet of contextual performance. Job dedication comprises behaviors such as hard work, following rules, and taking initiative with the aim of supporting organizational goals. Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) showed that conscientiousness was the strongest predictor of job dedication. By contrast, another meta-analysis (Chiaburu et al., 2011) found that the validity coefficient for conscientiousness was higher for organizational citizenship behavior directed at individuals (OCB-I) than at the organization (OCB-O). However, this might be because several, yet different, OCB types were accumulated under the label OCB-O. In sum, conscientiousness should be associated with ratings of job dedication because conscientious individuals work diligently and feel a high sense of dutifulness toward the organization.

Previous research has argued (Penney et al., 2011) that conscientious individuals are mainly motivated by achievement striving, and previous research has shown that achievement striving is related to job performance (Barrick et al., 2002) and OCB-like performance facets (Bettencourt et al., 2001). Furthermore, research has shown that the combination of achievement striving and self-discipline is related to objective performance indicators (Wihler et al., 2017). Although Judge et al. (2013) showed that there is no difference between the two aspects of conscientiousness, industriousness (composed of achievement striving, competence, and self-discipline) and orderliness (deliberation, dutifulness, and order; DeYoung et al., 2007), we propose different effects for each aspect. Industriousness, in particular, should exhibit a stronger relationship with job dedication, a form of organization-directed OCB (OCB-O; Chiaburu et al., 2013), because it is characterized by the facets achievement striving, competence, and self-discipline. The expression of those trait facets should manifest in actual behavior that is characterized by "self-disciplined, motivated acts such as working hard, taking initiative, and following rules to support organizational objectives" (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996, p. 525). As the cited text indicates, conscientiousness and job dedication are integral parts of OCB-O (Chiaburu et al., 2013), making job dedication an outcome that is well aligned with conscientiousness personality traits. Such behavioral manifestations should be reflected in higher



FIGURE 2 Overview of the structure of personality, its relation to performance dimensions, and the study hypotheses

job dedication scores. In contrast, deliberation, order, and dutifulness reflect a more internal conscientious state (thinking before acting, being well-organized, fulfilling moral obligations) that does not necessarily transmit into expressive behaviors and would not be considered dedicated by oneself and others. Based on the above arguments, we predict that industriousness will exhibit a higher relation with job dedication than orderliness.

. . .

Hypothesis 1. For conscientiousness, the trait factor of the industriousness aspect will show higher associations with the job dedication arena factor than the aspect orderliness.

Because agreeableness is expected to affect cooperation, we chose the other facet of contextual performance, namely, interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) as the corresponding criterion for agreeableness. Interpersonal facilitation comprises extra-role behaviors such as considerate, cooperative, or helping behaviors directed toward coworkers. Thus, it is not surprising that agreeableness showed the highest correlation with interpersonal facilitation in the initial studies. Later, Chiaburu et al.'s (2011) meta-analysis confirmed the theoretical link and found that agreeableness had the second highest correlation (after conscientiousness and along with openness) with OCB-I (again including several work behaviors under this label).

For agreeableness, DeYoung et al. (2007) propose two aspects named compassion (tender-mindedness, altruism, trust) and politeness (compliance, modesty, straightforwardness). DeYoung et al. further note that politeness can be characterized as similar to the honesty-humility factor from the HEXACO (Lee & Ashton, 2004). This factor has been positively linked to prosociality (Aghababaei et al., 2014) and negatively to counterproductive work behavior (Oh, Lee, et al., 2011; Zettler & Hilbig, 2010). Thus, we expect the politeness aspect to be more strongly related to interpersonal facilitation than the compassion aspect.

Although Judge et al. (2013) reported no large differences between both aspects in predicting contextual behavior, this result might be based on investigating a combination of interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Hence, we expect more nuanced findings when focusing on interpersonal facilitation alone. Based on the nature of interpersonal facilitation, involving considerate, helpful, and cooperative behaviors (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), individuals high in politeness should express more modesty and straightforwardness (also facets of honesty–humility; Lee & Ashton, 2004), which should enable them to be more cooperative. Relatedly, Hilbig et al. (2013) describe honesty–humility (and thus by definition also politeness) as a tendency toward non-exploitation and empirically demonstrate that honesty–humility is positively related to active cooperation. Thus, politeness should also relate to cooperative work behaviors like interpersonal facilitation because the compassion aspect mainly captures the emotional aspects of belonging to others (DeYoung et al., 2007), which should not be directly linked to expressions of cooperative interpersonal facilitation.

Hypothesis 2. For agreeableness, the trait factor of the politeness aspect will show higher associations with the interpersonal facilitation arena factor than the compassion aspect.

Extraversion has predominantly been linked to specific performance dimensions that include behaviors such as influencing and convincing others, for example, sales (Grant, 2013; Vinchur et al., 1998) or leadership effectiveness (DeRue et al., 2011; Wilmot et al., 2019). One such performance dimension that comprises both aspects is enterprising performance (Blickle et al., 2012; Ewen et al., 2013; Gansen-Ammann et al., 2019), which, based on Holland's (1997) vocational RIASEC model, is used to capture the enterprising aspects that are featured in multiple jobs and are not specifically restricted to jobs in sales, marketing, and management. Based on this empirical evidence, we selected enterprising performance as the construct that should

correspond to extraversion. Individuals high in extraversion should be better able to successfully fulfill the enterprising aspects of their work performance (resulting in higher enterprising performance) because these individuals are more sociable and have higher activity and assertiveness levels to convince coworkers or customers.

DeYoung et al. (2007) distinguished two aspects of extraversion, namely, assertiveness (composed of activity, assertiveness, and excitement-seeking) and enthusiasm (composed of gregariousness, positive emotions, warmth, and excitement-seeking). However, in their conceptualization, excitement-seeking loaded on both factors. More recent research (Wilmot et al., 2019) sees assertiveness primarily composed of the facets assertiveness and activity, which has been labeled *social potency* by others (Blickle et al., 2015).

As Wilmot et al. (2019) point out, social potency has strong correlations with leader effectiveness, and thus, the trait factor of social potency should also be linked to enterprising performance. Active and assertive individuals are associated with leader emergence (Hu et al., 2019). They thus should also be able to take roles like convincing and leading others, coordinating a team, and striving for power. In contrast, enthusiasm should show no relationship to enterprising performance because positive emotions and warmth are not helpful in influencing others. Relatedly, Hu et al. (2019) found that warmth is not linked to leader emergence.

Furthermore, similar findings have been shown by Hogan and Holland (2003), who found that extraversion can be split into two factors, one named ambition, and content-wise close to social potency, and the other one sociability, closely linked to enthusiasm. These authors showed that ambition, but not sociability, was linked to corresponding performance indicators of leadership and sales performance. Consequently, we argue that social potency, with its components of activity and assertiveness, is expressed in more leader-like persuasive behaviors related to reputation, power, and status, captured by enterprising performance. In contrast, expressions of enthusiasm primarily represent the emotional elements and focus on friendly, sociable, and joyful experiences, which should result in the persuasive or leadership behaviors needed in jobs. Thus, for social potency, we expect a positive relationship between the trait factor and the enterprising performance arena factor, but do not expect such a relation for the trait factor of enthusiasm.

Hypothesis 3. For extraversion, the trait factor of the social potency aspect will show higher associations with the enterprising performance arena factor than the aspect enthusiasm.

Neuroticism is characterized by irrational and anxious behavioral tendencies as well as spontaneous mood changes and proneness to stress (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Barrick et al. (2001) found that neuroticism was the second most consistent predictor of job performance. However, following the paradigm of construct correspondence, we argue that neuroticism is also essential for interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Hogan and Shelton (1998) stated that individuals high in neuroticism are most likely to experience interpersonal difficulties in interactions with coworkers, who subsequently give less favorable evaluations of these individuals' interpersonal facilitation behaviors at work.

The aspects for neuroticism are labeled volatility (composed of angry hostility and impulsiveness) and withdrawal (composed of anxiety, depression, self-consciousness, and vulnerability; DeYoung et al., 2007). These authors note an important difference between the two states. Whereas volatility is linked to disinhibition, which leads to expressions of negative affect, the withdrawal aspect is better characterized by inward-directed anxiety. Thus, the less the . . .

volatility aspect is expressed by employees, the more it should reflect in higher ratings of interpersonal facilitation, characterized by "cooperative, considerate, and helpful acts" (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996, p. 525). The expression of high volatility and angry behaviors should lead to less positive evaluations of considerate behaviors. In contrast, withdrawal describes the more internal state of anxiety and vulnerability, which does not necessarily translate into less considerate behaviors. In other words, one could feel miserable inside, but still be helpful and considerate to others. Consequently, we expect the more outwards-oriented aspect of neuroticism to be more strongly linked to less interpersonal facilitation behavior, whereas internal neuroticism, that is, withdrawal, should not be related to interpersonal facilitation, as it should not affect one's behavioral orientations to others.

In support of the previous arguments, Judge et al. (2013) found a strong negative effect of volatility on contextual performance, whereas withdrawal was not related to contextual performance. In line with these previous arguments about the inward and outward expression of neurotic personality features and their link to contextual behaviors, we expect that the aspect of volatility is negatively related to interpersonal facilitation, whereas the aspect withdrawal should have no effect.

Hypothesis 4. For neuroticism, the aspect volatility will show higher associations with the interpersonal facilitation arena factor than the aspect withdrawal.

Finally, we turn to openness to experience. Whereas openness encompasses behaviors that show an appreciation of different cultures, food, or values (Costa & McCrae, 1992), it has also been linked to self-reported intellect (Hogan & Hogan, 1992). Thus, a meta-analysis investigating openness found that self-ratings were a weak predictor of general job performance but also showed that openness was strongly related to training performance (Barrick et al., 2001). Similarly, openness ratings were linked to the acquisition of job knowledge, training progress, and information processing (Hogan & Holland, 2003). Based on the ability of individuals high in openness to learn and to improve their skills, we selected career-role performance (Welbourne et al., 1998) as the corresponding construct. On the basis of role (Katz & Kahn, 1978) and identity (Thoits, 1992) theory, Welbourne et al. (1998) developed several roles that employees fulfill during their job. One of them is the career role, which is described as "obtaining the necessary skills to progress through one's organization" (Welbourne et al., 1998, p. 554). Because openness is associated with improved learning skills, it should also help a person acquire the necessary skills for career progression.

Finally, DeYoung et al. (2007) differentiated openness into two aspects, labeled intellect (only capturing the facet ideas) and aesthetic openness (composed of actions, aesthetics, fantasy, feelings, and values). Whereas intellect captures individuals' intellectual capacity and is linked to achievement orientation (Hogan & Holland, 2003), aesthetic openness captures aesthetic appreciation. Thus, it follows that intellect should be related to acquiring skills relevant for career progression, which is then reflected in more positive evaluations of careerrole performance. In contrast, aesthetic openness reflects the general tendency to be open to and impressed by the arts, the possession of imagination, and adventurousness and should thus be less relevant to, if not distract from, career progression and hence should relate less to career skill acquisition. In line with these theoretical arguments, we predict that the underlying achievement orientation captured by intellect will lead to a positive relationship with career-role performance, whereas aesthetic openness will not be related to career-role performance. **Hypothesis 5.** For openness, the trait factor of the intellect aspect will show higher associations with the career-role performance arena factor than the aspect aesthetic openness.

METHOD

First, we conducted a statistical power analysis (Faul et al., 2009) to estimate the necessary sample size for testing our hypotheses. Based on Oh, Wang, and Mount (2011) (Table 1), we expected average correlations to be $\rho = .29$, representing the averaged correlation across all personality traits for two observers with job performance. We used this value as conservative estimate since our study included one self-rater and two other-raters. Thus, there is enough evidence to expect that our effect sizes will be at least in a similar range. Based on a correlation of $\rho = .29$ (additional parameter: $\alpha = .05$, $\beta = .80$), the estimated sample size should be equal or larger than 91 triplets in each study.

DV = job dedication			
	Conscientiousness	Industriousness	Orderliness
Personality-trait			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.398***	.408***	.412***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.326**	.085	.457***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.300**	.233*	.294**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.833***	.657***	.777***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.883**	.528**	.718***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.787***	.690***	.613***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.669***	.604***	.615***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.574**	.333**	.514**
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.505***	.509***	.412**
Performance-arena			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.596**	.475**	.467*
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.513*	.401**	.313*
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.363**	.418***	.435*
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.225*	.249*	.286
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.505**	.593***	.615*
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.377*	.421*	.413
Personality-identity			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.778***	.729***	.718***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.858***	.948***	.666***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.806***	.748***	.757***

TABLE 1 Factor loadings of TRI-ABF models for conscientiousness, industriousness, or orderliness and job dedication—Sample 1

(Continues)

14

TABLE 1 (Continued)

$\mathbf{D}\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{job} \ \mathbf{dedication}$

	Conscientiousness	Industriousness	Orderliness
Performance-facade			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.660***	.743***	.783***
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.643**	.725***	.748***
Personality-reputation			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	022	.325**	.122
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	376	.803***	.269
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	100	.295*	.199
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	017	.298**	.096
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	244	.506***	.192
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	064	.218*	.133
Performance-blind spot			
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.412***	.385***	.349†
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.545***	.536***	.465**
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.572***	.547***	.494 [†]
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.915***	.907***	.671**
Other-Factor 1			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.316**	.347***	$.164^{\dagger}$
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.282**	.277*	.273**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	$.182^{\dagger}$.121	.151 [†]
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.691***	.737***	.620***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.743***	.686***	.838***
Other-Factor 2			
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.588***	.469***	.558***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.781***	.796***	.791***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.752***	.709***	.689***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.283**	.120	.393***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.146	018	.331**
Correlation (personality trait-performance arena)	.317 [†]	.407*	.125
Correlation (personality identity-performance facade)	.581**	.521***	.467***
Correlation (personality reputation– performance blind spot)	.307	.026	470
Correlation (personality trait-performance blind spot)	.540***	.475***	.738**

Notes: N = 354 participants = 118 triads. Standardized factor loadings are reported.

 $^{\dagger}p$ < .05 (one-tailed).

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Overview of samples

We tested our research hypotheses in five different samples (one for each Big Five trait domain). To assess all Big Five personality domains, aspects, and facets, we used the NEO-PI-R, which is the most comprehensive personality inventory that is based on the five-factor model of personality. It comprises eight items for each of the six facets of each personality domain (Costa & McCrae, 1992). We decided to study each personality trait domain in a separate sample to potentially maximize the number of respondents and minimize careless responding that could result from having to respond to the complete NEO-PI-R item set and the performance items (Kam & Meyer, 2015). We also aimed to obtain triplets of ratings from one target person and two coworkers in order to be able to assess targets' personality reputations (McAbee & Connelly, 2016) and performance blind spots (Luft & Ingham, 1955). Thus, we present a package with five different samples (overall N = 1713), each consisting of triplets of target employees and two coworkers.

Participants and procedures

To recruit participants, nine psychology students personally contacted employees in partial fulfillment of the students' study requirements. Recent research has shown that the diversity of this type of sampling can increase the external validity of results (Wheeler et al., 2014). To increase participants' response rate and commitment to the study, we conducted five different studies, each one focusing on one specific personality trait and its corresponding performance dimension.

Employees were asked whether they would like to take part in an online study (run via Unipark) on personality and workplace behavior and whether they would ask two coworkers to assess them as well. Upon agreement, participants were sent an invitation including a unique code that allowed us to match self- and other-ratings. After completing the survey, participants were asked to invite their coworkers via email. Coworkers could be peers, supervisors, or staff. Coworkers received a link to the other-rating survey using the same unique code as self-raters. To exclude that anyone took multiple surveys, emails were compared by the research team and triads were excluded when an email address was used multiple times. All participants were informed that their confidentiality would be preserved. Employee–coworker triads were collected from a broad range of jobs within the German workforce in order to ensure high variability and avoid range restrictions (Hunter & Schmidt, 2014). Information about the sample characteristics can be found in Table 2.

Measures

Personality

To assess personality, we utilized the German version (Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1993) of the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The NEO-PI-R assesses five broad personality traits (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) as well as each trait's six corresponding personality facets, which were used by Judge et al. (2013) to investigate the aspect level of personality (DeYoung et al., 2007). Thus, the NEO-PI-R consists of 240 items (48 for each trait, eight for each facet). In each study, both the target employees and the two

		Investigated	Age		Gende	r	Job ter	nure	Response
Sample	N	constructs	M	SD	Male	Female	M	SD	rate
1	118	Conscientiousness and job dedication	41.29	10.66	54	64	8.37	7.53	67.82%
2	115	Agreeableness and interpersonal facilitation	37.45	9.63	46	69	6.94	8.07	42.22%
3	98	Extraversion and enterprising performance	38.34	11.13	48	50	6.86	6.93	24.69%
4	104	Neuroticism and interpersonal facilitation	37.60	10.24	57	47	6.40	7.30	39.10%
5	136	Openness to experience and career-role performance	42.38	11.79	65	71	10.30	9.43	42.77%

TABLE 2 Overview of the sample and study characteristics of Samples 1-5

coworkers rated the target employees' personality on the 48 items that corresponded to the respective personality trait. In accordance with DeYoung et al. (2007) and, for extraversion, Blickle et al. (2015), we used the facets of assertiveness and activity to form the aspect of social potency. The NEO-PI-R is answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

In Sample 1, we assessed conscientiousness and its aspects industriousness and orderliness. Internal consistencies for all raters ranged from $.80 \le \alpha \le .92$ (see Supporting Information, Appendix B, Table B-2 for detailed information).

In Sample 2, we assessed agreeableness and its aspects compassion and politeness. Internal consistencies for all raters ranged from $.76 \le \alpha \le .92$ (see Supporting Information, Appendix B, Table B-2 for detailed information).

In Sample 3,¹ we measured extraversion and its aspects social potency (Wilmot et al., 2019) and enthusiasm. Internal consistencies for all raters ranged from .75 $\leq \alpha \leq$.91 (see Supporting Information, Appendix B, Table B-3 for detailed information).

In Sample 4, we assessed neuroticism and its aspects volatility and withdrawal. Internal consistencies for all raters ranged from $.82 \le \alpha \le .94$ (see Supporting Information, Appendix B, Table B-3 for detailed information).

Finally, in Sample 5, we administered the items for openness to experience and its aspects intellect and aesthetic openness. Internal consistencies for all raters ranged from $.78 \le \alpha \le .90$ (see Supporting Information, Appendix B, Table B-4 for detailed information).

Job performance

Based on the theoretical argument (e.g., Hogan & Holland, 2003) that predictors and criteria should be aligned, we used different performance criteria for each sample. Designed to assess

performance in different occupations, targets and coworkers rated the target employees in reference to individuals in comparable positions on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*much worse than other people in a comparable position*) to 5 (*a great deal better than other people in a comparable position*).

In Sample 1, we used five items by Ferris et al. (2001) to assess *job dedication*, a facet of contextual performance (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Ferris et al. (2001) showed that this measure possesses good psychometric properties. A sample item is "Responds to queries swiftly." Internal consistencies ranged from $.76 \le \alpha \le .83$.

In Sample 2, we assessed *interpersonal facilitation*, also part of contextual performance (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), with good psychometric properties (Ferris et al., 2001). A sample item is "Cooperates with other team members by sharing information openly." Internal consistencies ranged from $.72 \le \alpha \le .84$.

In Sample 3, we assessed *enterprising performance*, a performance domain capturing effectiveness in managing or influencing other people such as selling, persuading, and holding meetings (Holland, 1997). Based on Holland's (1997) theory of vocational interests, the 10 items were adapted from the German environmental structure test (Bergmann & Eder, 1992). The measure was developed and validated by Blickle et al. (2012) and was later used with success (Blickle et al., 2015). A sample item is "How good is this person at leading a group at work?" Internal consistencies ranged from .85 $\leq \alpha \leq .93$.

In Sample 4, we again assessed *interpersonal facilitation* as a performance dimension with the same measure as in Sample 2. This time, internal consistencies ranged from $.78 \le \alpha \le .81$.

Finally, in Sample 5, we assessed *career-role performance* (Welbourne et al., 1998). We used four items to assess employees' career-role performance. A sample item is "developing skills needed for his/her future career." Internal consistencies ranged from $.82 \le \alpha \le .91$.

Data analytic approach²

In order to test the theoretical assumptions of the TRI and the ABF models, we relied on confirmatory factor analyses to decompose the latent variances of the different item parcels. We conducted such analyses for both the aspects of personality as well as the trait domain to establish a baseline to compare validities. In each sample, we used exactly the same analytical approach. Prior to the analyses, driven by theoretical restrictions (e.g., there was only one facet for the intellect aspect of openness to experience) and methodological issues regarding the size of our samples, we built item parcels for both the personality and performance constructs (Matsunaga, 2008). Parceling was used to prevent model misidentification issues due to the fact that the number of parameters (e.g., for domain traits, we would have 3×60 indicators) would be larger than the sample size. We consistently applied parceling across all models to have a consistent approach for all models that allow for the comparison of correlations, including aspects and domain traits. For personality, we built three parcels per rater by balancing the facets of each domain or aspect per parcel (i.e., each parcel consisted of equal numbers of items per facet). For performance, we built two parcels per rater, primarily due to the restricted number of items per performance dimension.

Next, we compared several measurement models per sample against each other. We model one model with two correlated general factors and one where we added three additional, uncorrelated source factors. Finally, in the third model, we specified the combined bifactor TRI-personality-ABF-performance model (McAbee & Connelly, 2016). A more detailed description of each model can be found in the Supporting Information, Appendix A.

Before testing our hypotheses, we compared both the absolute model fit and relative model fit indicators of the TRI–ABF model compared with the two less restricted models to evaluate the appropriateness of using the TRI–ABF model. We used Mplus 8.6 (Muthén & Muthén, 2021) for all confirmatory factor analyses.

In line with Eid et al. (2008), we consider the other-raters as interchangeable (in contrast to being structurally different), because they provide similar information regarding personality and performance. Furthermore, idiosyncratic information is captured by the respective source factors for each other-rater. We therefore model each rater with equal loadings for the respective factors that are not set equal within factors.³

Testing our hypotheses required us to evaluate the correlation between the personality trait and the job-performance arena factors. Furthermore, to evaluate the strength of the correlation between personality trait factor and performance arena factor, we also included the correlation between personality trait factor and performance blind spot factor to assess the relationship between personality and reputational elements (Hogan & Shelton, 1998). Next, we compared the correlations of the trait and arena factors between the respective personality domain and its aspects using *Z*-tests for independent samples (Steiger, 1980). Although the correlations of interest (domain vs. aspect trait with performance arena) stem from the same sample, this reflects a more conservative test of correlation differences because the denominator of the *Z*-statistic increases with higher correlations between constructs (Steiger, 1980). We used *Z*-tests for dependent samples (Steiger, 1980) to evaluate the difference in correlations from trait–arena and trait–blind spot factors.

RESULTS

Table B-1 (Supporting Information, Appendix B) presents the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability estimates of the study variables. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .72 to .94 and could thus be considered good (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Tables B-2–B-4 (Supporting Information, Appendix B) present the correlations of our core constructs.

Measurement models

Overall, in all samples, the TRI model fit the data best or showed comparable fit compared with the comparison models. Detailed information about fit indices and results of chi-square difference tests can be found in the Supporting Information, Appendix C, and Table C-1.

Hypothesis testing

Conscientiousness

As elaborated above, Hypothesis 1 predicted that the industriousness aspect would exhibit a stronger correlation between the trait and performance arena factors than the aspect of orderliness would.

For conscientiousness (Sample 1), the results and factor loadings for the TRIpersonality-ABF-performance models are shown in Table 1. First, for the industriousness aspect, all loadings were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .233$ except for one $(\lambda = .085, p = .44)$. The same picture emerged for the orderliness aspect: All loadings were significant at p < .01 and greater than $\lambda \ge .294$. For the conscientiousness domain, all factor loadings for the personality trait and performance arena factors were significant at p < .01 and greater than $\lambda \ge .300$. In contrast to orderliness, the trait factor for industriousness showed a positive and significant correlation with the performance arena factor (industriousness: $\rho = .41$, 95%*CI*[.04, .77], p < .001; orderliness: $\rho = .13$, 95%*CI*[-.32, .57], p = .58).

For the conscientiousness domain, the correlation between the trait factor and the arena factor was positive, but not significant ($\rho = .32$, 95%*CI*[-.01, .64], p = .06). The correlation for industrious was significantly greater than for orderliness (z = 2.32, p < .05), but not greater than the correlation between the personality domain and the performance arena factor for conscientiousness (industriousness: z = .79, p = .22; orderliness: z = 1.54, p = .06). In sum, these findings support Hypothesis 1.

In addition, we evaluated the relationship between the personality trait and performance blind spot. The results showed that this correlation was significant for conscientiousness ($\rho = .54$, p < .001), industriousness ($\rho = .45$, p < .001), and orderliness ($\rho = .74$, p < .01). In addition, *Z*-tests indicated that the trait–arena correlations for industriousness were not different from the respective trait–blind spot correlation (z = .61, p = .27), whereas the correlation for orderliness was (z = 5.96, p < .001). This was also the case for the personality domain correlations (z = 2.01, p < .05).

Agreeableness

Hypothesis 2 stated that the politeness aspect would exhibit a stronger correlation between the trait and performance arena factors than the compassion aspect. Table 3 shows the results and factor loadings for the TRI-personality-ABF-performance models for agreeableness (Study 2). For the compassion aspect, almost all loadings were significant at p < .01 and greater than $\lambda \ge .239$. For politeness, almost all loadings were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .245$ except for two ($\lambda = .178$, p = .08, & $\lambda = .180$, p = .08). For the agreeableness domain, all factor loadings for the personality trait and the performance arena factor were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .229$.

Contrary to Hypothesis 2, the compassion aspect exhibited a higher correlation between the trait factor and the performance arena factor ($\rho = .84$, 95%*CI*[.24, 1.00], p < .001), whereas the correlation for politeness was $\rho = .76$ (95%*CI*[.47, 1.00], p < .001) and significantly weaker than the correlation for the compassion aspect (z = 2.80, p < .01), but not the domain factor ($\rho = .67$, 95%*CI*[.42, .92], p < .001, z = 1.42, p = .08). Furthermore, the correlation for compassion was greater than for agreeableness (z = 3.35, p < .001).

Again, we also evaluated the relationship between the personality trait and performance blind spot. The results showed that this correlation was not significant for agreeableness ($\rho = -.06$, p = .86), compassion ($\rho = -.00$, p = 1.00), or politeness ($\rho = -.26$, p = .36). In addition, Z-tests indicated that compassion, politeness, and agreeableness trait-arena correlations were larger than the respective trait-blind spot correlations (compassion: z = 8.72, p < .001; politeness: z = 9.32, p < .001; agreeableness: z = 6.43, p < .001). **TABLE 3** Factor loadings of TRI-ABF models for agreeableness, compassion, or politeness and interpersonal facilitation—Sample 2

DV = interpersonal facilitation

	Agreeableness	Compassion	Politeness
Personality-trait			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.391***	.781***	.245*
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.229*	.636***	$.180^{\dagger}$
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.290**	.658***	$.178^{\dagger}$
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.912***	.436***	.690***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.882***	.485***	.669***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.846***	.308**	.551***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.701***	.347***	.709***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.668***	.393***	.690***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.631***	.239**	.559***
Performance-arena			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.335**	.583**	.158
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.227*	.565*	.322**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.605***	.312*	.690***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.562***	.302**	.369*
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.785***	.360*	.777***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.734***	.390**	.546*
Personality-identity			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.762***	.274 [†]	.755***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.712***	.426**	.707***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.805***	.598***	.723***
Performance-facade			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.942***	.420*	.660***
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.637***	.825***	.947***
Personality-reputation			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.011	.743***	087
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.262	.681***	.186
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.197	.786***	.180
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.008	.591***	089
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.198	.551***	.192
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.147	.609***	.183
Performance-blind spot			
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	340	.667***	.248
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	058	.462***	.495***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	441	.770***	.279
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	076	.598***	.733***

TABLE 3 (Continued)

DV = interpersonal facilitation			
	Agreeableness	Compassion	Politeness
Other-Factor 1			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	118	210*	475***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	151^{\dagger}	244**	606***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	200*	231*	.672***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.413***	.676***	.413**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.825***	.425***	.436***
Other-Factor 2			
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.659***	.596***	.495***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.668***	.614***	.533***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.638***	.650***	.481***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	$.144^{\dagger}$.249***	.133
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.163 [†]	.184*	.405**
Correlation (personality trait-performance arena)	.672***	.837**	.762***
Correlation (personality identity-performance facade)	.110	613^{\dagger}	065
Correlation (personality reputation–performance blind spot)	.293	.731***	142
Correlation (personality trait-performance blind spot)	064	002	258

Notes: N = 345 participants = 115 triads. Standardized factor loadings are reported. [†]p < .05 (one-tailed).

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Extraversion

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the social potency aspect would exhibit a stronger correlation between the trait and performance arena factors than the enthusiasm aspect. For extraversion (Sample 3), the results and factor loadings for the TRI-personality-ABF-performance models are shown in Table 4. First, for the social potency aspect, all loadings were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .268$. The same picture emerged for the enthusiasm aspect: All loadings were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .251$. For the extraversion domain, all loadings for the personality trait factor were significant at p < .001, and loadings for the performance arena factor were significant at p < .05 and greater than $\lambda \ge .337$. The correlation between the social potency aspect and the performance arena factor was $\rho = .73$ (95%*CI*[.32, 1.00], p < .001), but not significantly higher than the correlation between the performance arena factor and the performance arena factor of extraversion ($\rho = .69$, 95%*CI*[.19, 1.00], p < .001, z = .540, p = .294). By contrast, the enthusiasm aspect was not significantly correlated with the performance arena factor ($\rho = .37$, 95%*CI*[-.05, .78], p = .083), and the magnitude of the correlation was smaller than both the domain and social potency correlations (extraversion: z = 3.186, p < .001; social potency: z = 3.726, p < .001).

For extraversion and its aspects, we also evaluated the relationship between the personality trait and performance blind spot. The results showed that this correlation was not significant

TABLE 4 Factor loadings of TRI-ABF models for extraversion, social potency, or enthusiasm and enterprising performance—Sample 3

DV = enterprising	performance
--------------------------	-------------

	Extraversion	Social potency	Enthusiasm
Personality-trait			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.513***	.787***	.380***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.473***	.811***	.380**
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.482***	.696***	.527***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.809***	.401***	.640**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.692***	.304**	.630**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.747***	.404***	.774***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.617***	.389***	.456**
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.465***	.317**	.548**
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.516***	.359***	.557***
Performance-arena			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.373*	.848**	.299**
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.337*	.836**	.251*
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.455***	.269*	.555***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.446*	.271*	.596***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.542***	.268*	.788***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.556*	.290*	.916***
Personality-identity			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.629***	.175	.609***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.827***	.124	.922***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.646***	.718***	.561***
Performance-facade			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.803***	.458	.816***
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.826***	.177	.880***
Personality-reputation			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.280	.517***	.558*
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.718***	.421***	.461
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.351*	.520***	.176
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.213	.502***	.397*
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.482***	.439***	.401
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.242*	.463***	.126
Performance-blind spot			
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.343*	.251	029
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.432*	.135	.031
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.408*	.250	041
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.539*	.144	.048

DV = enterprising performance			
	Extraversion	Social potency	Enthusiasm
Other-Factor 1			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.061	.287**	.119
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.069	.373***	.251 [†]
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.174	.256**	.332**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.737***	.837***	.762***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.784***	.931***	.803***
Other-Factor 2			
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.576***	.276**	579***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.659***	.452***	632***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.741***	.337***	739***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.575***	.801***	362*
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.632***	.946***	398*
Correlation (personality trait-performance arena)	.689***	.728***	.366 [†]
Correlation (personality identity-performance facade)	.449***	.233	.362**
Correlation (personality reputation-performance blind spot)	.513*	.725 [†]	484
Correlation (personality trait-performance blind spot)	323	.469	215

Notes: N = 294 participants = 98 triads. Standardized factor loadings are reported. $^{\dagger}p$ < .05 (one-tailed).

p < .05. p < .01. p < .001.

for extraversion ($\rho = -.32$, p = .547), social potency ($\rho = .47$, p = .158), or enthusiasm ($\rho = -.22$, p = .754). In addition, *Z*-tests indicated that trait–arena correlations were larger than the respective trait–blind spot correlations (social potency: z = 2.845, p < .01; extraversion: z = 8.073, p < .001; enthusiasm: z = 4.145, p < .001). Overall, the results support Hypothesis 3.

Neuroticism

Hypothesis 4 stated that the volatility aspect would exhibit a stronger correlation between the trait and performance arena factors than the withdrawal aspect. Table 5 shows the results and factor loadings for the TRI-personality-ABF-performance models for neuroticism (Sample 4). In general, for the domain and both aspects, all loadings for the trait factor were significant (p < .001), and the lowest loadings ranged from .445 to .493. However, in all three models, the performance arena factor had insignificant loadings for self-reported performance ($-.065 \le \lambda \le .113$, .298 $\le p \le .558$).

Both neuroticism and volatility exhibited negative and significant correlations with the performance arena factor (neuroticism: $\rho = -.41$, 95%*CI*[-.71, -.10], p = .009; volatility: $\rho = -.37$, **TABLE 5** Factor loadings of TRI-ABF models for neuroticism, volatility, or withdrawal and interpersonal facilitation—Sample 4

DV = interpersonal facilitation

	Neuroticism	Volatility	Withdrawal
Personality-trait			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.535***	.445***	.537***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.519***	.447***	.495***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.493***	.474***	.469***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.677***	.543***	.816***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.760***	.682***	.853***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.686***	.685***	.811***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.809***	.718***	.680***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.770***	.836***	.676***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.790***	.732***	.680***
Performance-arena			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.001	.074	065
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.101	.113	.058
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.575***	.788***	.461**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.678***	.768***	.587***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.643***	.602***	.601**
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.752***	.585***	.756***
Personality-identity			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.799***	.767***	.778***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.787***	.692***	.804***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.813***	.622***	.834***
Performance-facade			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.854***	.997***	.806***
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.820***	.695***	.873***
Personality-reputation			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	046	.297*	141
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.148	.120	.074
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	087	081	153
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	055	.393*	118
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.150	.147	.059
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	100	087	128
Performance-blind spot			
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.354 [†]	.229	.382 [†]
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.157	041	.221
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.395 [†]	.175	.498 [†]
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.174	031	.285

TABLE 5 (Continued)

DV = interpersonal facilitation			
	Neuroticism	Volatility	Withdrawal
Other-Factor 1			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.631***	.786***	442**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.633***	.491***	313*
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.620***	.395***	431**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	661***	112	.801***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	512***	015	.569***
Other-Factor 2			
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.478**	320*	.657***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.609***	280*	.691***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.453**	281**	.639***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.416**	.709***	.142
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.440**	.630***	.103
Correlation (personality trait-performance arena)	406**	372*	411^{\dagger}
Correlation (personality identity-performance facade)	469***	373***	456***
Correlation (personality reputation-performance blind spot)	.695 [†]	.503	.743 [†]
Correlation (personality trait-performance blind spot)	.103	345	.364

Notes: N = 312 participants = 104 triads. Standardized factor loadings are reported. [†]p < .05 (one-tailed).

p < .05. p < .01. p < .001.

95%*CI*[-.72, -.02], p = .038); for withdrawal, the correlation between the trait factor and the arena factor was nonsignificant ($\rho = -.41$, 95%*CI*[-.87, .05], p = .077).

Consequently, the correlations between the two aspects volatility and withdrawal were not significantly different from each other (z = .327, p = .372), nor were the correlations between the personality domain factor and the performance arena factor (volatility: z = .285, p = .388; withdrawal: z = .043, p = .483), thus not supporting Hypothesis 4.

Finally, we evaluated the relationship between the personality trait and performance blind spot. The results showed that this correlation was not significant for neuroticism ($\rho = .10$, p = .749), volatility ($\rho = -.35$, p = .293), or withdrawal ($\rho = .36$, p = .408). In addition, Z-tests indicated that the trait-arena correlations for both withdrawal and neuroticism were larger than the respective trait-blind spot correlations (withdrawal: z = 5.814, p < .001; neuroticism: z = 5.75, p < .001).

Openness

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the intellect aspect would exhibit a stronger correlation between the trait and performance arena factors than the aesthetic openness aspect. For openness to experience (Study 5), the results and factor loadings for the TRI-personality-ABF-performance

models are shown in Table 6. First, all loadings for both the personality domain and both aspects were significant at p < .05 at least and greater than $\lambda \ge .296$.

The correlation between the personality trait factor of intellect and the performance arena factor was positive and significant ($\rho = .56$, 95%*CI*[.28, .84], p < .001), but not significantly

TABLE 6 Factor loadings of TRI-ABF models for openness, intellect, or aesthetic openness and career-role performance—Sample 5

DV = career-role performance			
	Openness	Intellect	Aesthetic openness
Personality-trait			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.686***	.446***	.689***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.588***	.457***	.816***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.597***	.456***	.677***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.613***	.624***	.496***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.622***	.688***	.802***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.583***	.646***	.571***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.684***	.772***	.587***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.677***	.719***	.793***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.679***	.635***	.588***
Performance-arena			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.317**	.427***	.296*
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.353***	.372***	.359**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.677***	.562***	.433***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.691***	.465***	.550***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	.616***	.653**	.482***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.580***	.549***	.576***
Personality-identity			
Self-Personality Parcel 1	.533***	.678***	.397***
Self-Personality Parcel 2	.689***	.725**	.371***
Self-Personality Parcel 3	.624***	.622***	.492***
Performance-facade			
Self-Performance Parcel 1	.665***	.619***	.671***
Self-Performance Parcel 2	.936***	.928***	.933***
Personality-reputation			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	$.309^{\dagger}$.254 [†]	.521***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.205	048	.019
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.261	.061	.296***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.345	.314 [†]	.617***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.223	050	.019
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.304	.060	.304***

TABLE 6 (Continued)

DV = career-role performance			
	Openness	Intellect	Aesthetic openness
Performance-blind spot			
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.081	.240	.432**
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.343	.408**	.337**
Other 2-Performance arcel 1	.074	.279	.481**
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	.288	.482**	.353**
Other-Factor 1			
Other 1-Personality Parcel 1	.631***	.530***	.477***
Other 1-Personality Parcel 2	.517***	.457***	.222**
Other 1-Personality Parcel 3	.586***	.395***	.338***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 1	.552***	.698***	.678***
Other 1-Performance Parcel 2	.636***	.733***	.704***
Other-Factor 2			
Other 2-Personality Parcel 1	.381***	553***	.525***
Other 2-Personality Parcel 2	.411***	249*	.216**
Other 2-Personality Parcel 3	.391***	035	.338***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 1	757***	.613***	710***
Other 2-Performance Parcel 2	691***	.595***	594***
Correlation (personality trait-performance arena)	.412***	.561***	.192
Correlation (personality identity-performance facade)	.123	.109	.073
Correlation (personality reputation-performance blind spot)	299	.673*	.827**
Correlation (personality trait-performance blind spot)	.012	.315	031

Notes: N = 408 participants = 136 triads. Standardized factor loadings are reported.

[†]*p* < .05 (one-tailed). **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

higher than the correlation for the personality domain ($\rho = .41$, 95%*CI*[.20, .62], p = .001; z = 1.60, p = .055). By contrast, the aspect of aesthetic openness was not significantly correlated with the performance arena factor ($\rho = .19$, 95%*CI*[-.11, .50], p = .115), and this correlation was significantly weaker than the correlation for the intellect aspect (z = 3.58, p < .001) and the domain of openness (z = 1.99, p = .023).

Finally, we evaluated the relationship between the personality trait and performance blind spot. The results showed that this correlation was not significant for openness ($\rho = .01$, p = .961), intellect ($\rho = .32$, p = .110), or aesthetic openness ($\rho = -.03$, p = .875). In addition, *Z*-tests indicated that the trait–arena correlations for both aspects and openness were larger than the respective trait–blind spot correlations (intellect: z = 2.41, p = .008; aesthetic openness: z = 1.84, p = .033; openness: z = 3.44, p < .001). Overall, these results supported Hypothesis 5.

DISCUSSION

Despite repeated claims in the past (Mischel, 1977; Morgeson et al., 2007) that personality does not play much of a role in determining behavior and job performance, continuous advancements in this area of psychological research have led to a more fine-grained understanding of how personality is associated with job performance (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011). Focusing on implications of information knowledge asymmetry (Vazire, 2010), we took a more nuanced approach and integrated several streams of research: the TRI model (McAbee & Connelly, 2016) for combining self- and other-ratings, construct correspondence for aligning predictors and criteria (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974), and new advancements in the understanding of more narrow aspects of personality traits as compared with broad domains (DeYoung et al., 2007). We expected that the aspect trait factors would be substantially correlated with their corresponding performance criteria.

Across five samples, we were able to show that the personality trait factors exhibited substantial correlations with specific performance criteria, even when controlling for the traitblind spot factor correlations. Thus, the consideration and combination of multiple perspectives on personality make a difference in predicting job performance. Whereas we found empirical support for relations with performance dimensions across all personality domains, our hypotheses referring to stronger relations between an aspect trait factor and a corresponding performance arena factor were supported only in three out of five personality domains (60%), namely, for conscientiousness (here both aspects were stronger), agreeableness, and openness (although agreeableness also showed a pattern on the aspect level different from our hypothesis).

Theoretical implications

Our results strengthen our understanding about the nature of relations between personality and job performance in several ways. First, the combination of self- and other-ratings of personality and the application of bifactor models can differentiate trait variance that is shared by all raters from rater-specific or error variance (McAbee & Connelly, 2016). Thus, our approach allowed us to control for potential distortions in personality ratings that would otherwise confound results (König et al., 2017). Similarly, previous research has shown that such rater-effects also exist for performance evaluations (Hoffman et al., 2010). By also applying the bifactor model concept to performance ratings, we were able to provide a clearer picture of a target person's performance based on raters' shared variance that is distinct from unique rater influences and distortions. Second, echoing previous claims about aligning the predictor and criterion (Hogan & Holland, 2003; Tett & Christiansen, 2007), we were able to uncover higher estimates of criterion validity for personality in predicting performance than were previously found (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011) when focusing primarily on other-ratings. Hence, whereas other-raters provide better validity estimates of personality traits for performance than self-ratings, combining self- and other-ratings can increase validity coefficients even more. Thus, we suggest that the information provided by self-ratings appears to be useful after all and should not be abandoned for the sole use of other-ratings. As our research shows, the resulting loss of valuable information would be drastic while providing room for confounding influences to insert themselves (König et al., 2017).

Third, our results show that moving beyond the investigation of broad personality traits has additional merits. By also considering the aspect levels suggested by DeYoung et al. (2007), we

were able to draw better-informed conclusions about the nature of the relations between personality and job performance. We also found strong correlations between personality domains and performance dimensions. In four cases (i.e., for conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness), the investigation at the aspect level revealed that one aspect was not significantly related to the specific performance dimension, oftentimes decreasing the magnitude of the correlation at the domain level. Furthermore, for agreeableness and openness, the correlation between the other aspect and performance was significantly higher than the correlation with the broad domain. Hence, our research predominantly supports previous claims (e.g., Hogan & Roberts, 1996; Paunonen et al., 1999) that researchers should focus on more narrow traits to avoid masking substantial effects by including unnecessary information.

Differences in our findings to those reported by Connelly et al. (2021) also warrant notice. Especially, for three traits (conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism), we can directly compare the validities for specific performance dimensions from the two different models. Whereas Connelly et al. (2021) only found significant effects on outcomes for the reputation factors (and in the case of agreeableness also for the identity factor), our results show that the correlation between trait and arena factor was in all three cases significant for the domain traits as well as at least one aspect. Again, this highlights the importance of using aspects aligning with the performance domain, but also the necessity for decomposing performance ratings (Hoffman et al., 2010), because it appears that idiosyncratic information in performance ratings can mask important findings and may underestimate the value of shared personality information.

Finally, we also compared the trait–arena factor correlations with those of the personality trait and performance blind spot correlations to investigate the comparable strength of the shared information versus reputation (Hogan & Shelton, 1998). Here, some interesting differences occurred: In four cases (agreeableness, extraversion, neuroticism, openness), the trait–arena correlation was significantly stronger than the trait–blind spot correlations. In contrast, for conscientiousness, the correlations were comparable in magnitude. Among the significant aspects, only the correlations for industriousness and volatility did not significantly differ from one another. Overall, this sheds light on an interesting point, namely, that for some performance measures (here job dedication), other-ratings provide more useful information than the combination of self- and other-ratings. This suggests that self-perceptions of citi behaviors (i.e., job dedication) seem to be particularly biased. Thus, the applicability of shared performance information needs to be evaluated against potential self-serving biases that contradict the general advantage of using multiple rater sources (Hoffman et al., 2010).

In addition, we found differential effects for the aspects of agreeableness: Whereas previous research (e.g., Judge et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2019) suggested only a positive effect of politeness, in fact both compassion and politeness were strongly correlated with interpersonal facilitation, although the results for agreeableness were consistently smaller. At second glance, this result no longer seems particularly counterintuitive. Compassion includes the facet of altruism (DeYoung et al., 2007), and research on prosocial behaviors has shown that altruism is an important factor of helping (e.g., Batson & Oleson, 1991).

Furthermore, Lee et al. (2019) investigated overall OCB that, besides helping (a form of OCB-I), also includes domains like compliance and loyalty (forms of OCB-O; Chiaburu et al., 2013). This broadness might have affected the resulting relationships and led to the findings. However, taking a closer look at facets of OCB can reveal differences in the relationships between the agreeableness aspects and interpersonal facilitation or other forms of OCB-I. Thus, our approach might be able to better account for rater influences and explain why our results

. . .

differed from the results of previous studies. Future research should investigate whether the aspects of agreeableness relate consistently differently to the different forms of OCB to shed more light on these underlying issues.

Our integrative approach could also account for potential influences of common source variance. Whereas all sources provided information about both personality and job performance, the approach we applied to decompose the variance into shared and rater-unique information enabled us to estimate criterion validity in our TRI-ABF model above and beyond the common source variance caused by Rater A, Rater B, the variance shared between reputation and blind spot, and the variance shared between identity and façade.

Practical implications

From a practical point of view, our results help to inform the utility of personality ratings in an HRD context: Organizations may use the TRI–ABF approach for performance management and promotions, that is, the reassigning individuals to new jobs based on their personality or other test scores (Connelly et al., 2018). Our design in which we combined self- and otherratings of personality traits with self- and other-ratings of specific job-performance dimensions by one target and at least two coworkers can be implemented in a 360° feedback procedure. DeNisi and Murphy (2017) pointed out (a) that targets' participation in the performance assessment was strongly correlated with employees' justice perceptions and (b) that the use of performance raters (i.e., coworkers) who are familiar with the real work process (i.e., coworkers with sufficient rater knowledge) was an important predictor of perceptions of fairness and rating accuracy.

Applying the TRI-ABF approach will provide two kinds of important information for organizations. First, there can be a mismatch between the personality traits and the relevant job demands. There might be strength in specific personality dimensions in a target employee that are not optimally matched with the present job but in another job in the same organization. Second, there may be underperforming targets (i.e., although their trait level is sufficient, they have yet to reach the performance level expected by the organization). In such cases, organizations can provide training and other employee development support (Brown & Sitzmann, 2011) by using the TRI-ABF approach.

Second, our results show that the tendency to design brief global personality measures (e.g., BFI-K, Rammstedt & John, 2005; BFI-10, Rammstedt & John, 2007) might not be the best way to assess personality in the work context. Although time and space granted in practical settings often is limited, not only has the validity of these measures been criticized (Credé et al., 2012). As our results show, important information regarding differences between the domain and more narrow levels of personality might get lost. By contrast, given the previously found validities, assessing personality with 200 (e.g., HEXACO; Lee & Ashton, 2004) or even 240 items (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) might be challenging to justify, especially in collaboration with organizations. One solution for this problem might be applying a measure designed by DeYoung et al. (2007). Using 100 items, the measure is explicitly designed to capture the 10 aspects of personality, which then could be aggregated to the domain level.

Our findings provide further support for the recommendation that researchers and practitioners alike should consider the potential value of self-ratings of personality. Although previously shown to have only limited predictive potential (Barrick et al., 2001), self-ratings in combination with other-ratings in TRI models appear to provide additional information that would otherwise get lost. Whereas other-raters seem preferable (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011), these raters might not be the most valid informants themselves (König et al., 2017). Furthermore, similar effects have been brought forward for performance ratings as well (Hoffman et al., 2010). Bringing the two perspectives together, TRI-ABF models are able to eliminate rater contaminations and assess the variance shared by all raters of constructs of interest. In our view, self-ratings have merit if used in combination with additional information such as other-ratings.

Limitations and future research

Of course, our research comes with several limitations that warrant consideration. First, although we utilized multisource data, our data were cross-sectional. Hence, inferences about causality could not be drawn. However, another potential criticism, namely, that personality and performance stem from the same sources with potential implications of common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2012), was of less concern because the latent variance decomposition in bifactor models accounted for individual source effects.

Second, it is often necessary to constrain parameters in bifactor models due to negative residual variances and the resulting non-convergence (Eid et al, 2008). In several of our analyses, Heywood cases occurred due to the model specification. However, it needs to be noted that such constraints limit the interpretation of our findings. Thus, further studies with larger sample sizes seem warranted to test the robustness of our findings.

Third, we were restricted in the time we had to administer our survey, especially for the commitment of other-raters. Thus, we had to compromise by focusing on specific, theoretically meaningful performance dimensions and measuring each personality trait in a separate study. For future studies, a more comprehensive assessment of personality, and the use of multiple performance criteria, would be preferable. However, given that our study is the first of its kind to link self- and other-ratings of performance and personality, we provide a basis for researchers to apply the extended TRI–ABF model in future studies.

In terms of future research, an extension of the TRI–ABF model focusing on personality traits such as the dark triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) as well as on counterproductive work behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) might explain why meta-analytic studies on the roles of these traits concluded that the effect sizes were small and the moderating influences were unknown (O'Boyle et al., 2012).

Another point that warrants future research is that for neuroticism, self-ratings of performance (i.e., interpersonal facilitation) were not related to the performance arena factor. One plausible explanation might be that neurotic individuals' perceptions of their own performance differ from other-raters' perceptions. Here, the characteristics of neuroticism might come into play, namely, anxiety, hostility, and proneness to stress. Maybe neurotic individuals perceive themselves as more helpful than they actually are, resulting in our study in a strong façade factor but only weak loadings on the arena factor. Hence, future research could investigate explicit differences between self- and other-ratings of personality to uncover how this bias comes into existence. Finally, the differential effects for agreeableness and neuroticism in our study compared with Judge et al.'s (2013) results might warrant further consideration to ensure that the results are replicable and can, in fact, be attributed to the TRI–ABF model compared with direct self- or other-ratings of personality.

CONCLUSION

APPLIED

1 .

In an integrative approach, we synthesized several distinct yet coherent theoretical streams to combine the TRI model of personality with an ABF model of job performance and investigated the relations between shared variance in personality ratings and shared variance in ratings of specific performance dimensions. Across all Big Five dimensions, the results revealed nuanced effect size estimates between corresponding personality–performance combinations at the domain level. For agreeableness, extraversion, and openness, one aspect of personality even had a higher association with a specific job-performance dimension than personality measured at the domain level did. We hope that our integrative approach spurs research regarding the role of personality with reference to job performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Marius Braun, Susen Fischer, Janicka Klöckner, and Eva-Sophie Schneider for their help in the data collection process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

As we followed standard procedures in applied psychological research (e.g., informed consent and adherence to the Data Protection Guidelines of the European Union) and did not touch on sensitive topics nor used body invasive procedures or drugs, the procedure and the materials of the study needed no special approval by the ethics committee of the Institute for Psychology of the University of Bonn.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Andreas Wihler contributed to study conceptualization, data preparation, data analysis, report writing, and editing. Gerhard Blickle contributed to study conceptualization, data analysis, report writing, and editing. Christian Ewen and Hanna contributed to study conceptualization and data collection. Sonja Fritze, Lena Völkl, Roxanne Merkl, Tamara Missfeld, and Melanie Mützel contributed to data collection.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available on OSF at https://osf.io/ ys72j/?view_only=f48aeaf9414d46fb81019186030afbdc

ORCID

Andreas Wihler D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1721-7930

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Parts of this dataset have been used in a prior publication (Blickle et al., 2015), but research questions and analytical procedure differ considerably.
- ² The data and code for this study are openly available at https://osf.io/ys72j/?view_only= f48aeaf9414d46fb81019186030afbdc
- ³ We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out and the suggestion to use equal loadings for otherraters shared information.

REFERENCES

- Aghababaei, N., Mohammadtabar, S., & Saffarinia, M. (2014). Dirty dozen vs. the H factor: Comparison of the dark triad and honesty-humility in prosociality, religiosity, and happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 6–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.026
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1&2), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00160
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 43–51. https://doi. org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.43
- Batson, C. D., & Oleson, K. C. (1991). Current status of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 12. Prosocial behavior) (pp. 62–85). Sage.
- Bergmann, C., & Eder, F. (1992). Umwelt-Struktur-test manual [environmental-structure-test]. Beltz.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. (2001). A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.29
- Blickle, G., John, J., Ferris, G. R., Momm, T., Liu, Y., Haag, R., Meyer, G., Weber, K., & Oerder, K. (2012). Fit of political skill to the work context: A two-study investigation. *Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 295–322. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00469.x
- Blickle, G., Meurs, J. A., Wihler, A., Ewen, C., Merkl, R., & Missfeld, T. (2015). Extraversion and job performance: How context relevance and bandwidth specificity create a non-linear, positive, and asymptotic relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 87, 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.12.009
- Blickle, G., Schütte, N., & Wihler, A. (2018). Political will, work values, and objective career success: A novel approach – The trait-reputation-identity model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 107, 42–56. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jvb.2018.03.002
- Borkenau, P., & Ostendorf, F. (1993). NEO-PI-R nach Costa & McCrae [NEO-PI-R by Costa and McCrae]. Hogrefe.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, K. G., & Sitzmann, T. (2011). Training and employee development for improved performance. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 2: Selecting and developing members for the organization) (pp. 469–504). APA.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology ogy. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Lorinkova, N. M., & van Dyne, L. (2013). Employees' social context and change-oriented citizenship: A meta-analysis of leader, coworker, and organizational influences. Group & Organization Management, 38(3), 291–333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113476736
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140–1166. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024004
- Connelly, B. S., McAbee, S. T., Oh, I.-S., Jung, Y., & Jung, C.-W. (2021). A multirater perspective on personality and performance: An empirical examination of the trait–reputation–identity model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000732
- Connelly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(6), 1092–1122. https://doi.org/10. 1037/a0021212
- Connelly, B. S., Ones, D. S., & Hülsheger, U. R. (2018). Personality in industrial, work and organizational psychology: Theory, measurement and application. In D. S. Ones, N. Anderson, C. Viswesvaran, &

H. K. Sinangil (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of industrial, work & organizational psychology* (Vol. 1: Personnel psychology and employee performance) (pp. 320–365). SAGE Publications.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Neo PI-R professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

- Cote, J. A., & Buckley, M. R. (1987). Estimating trait, method, and rrror variance: Generalizing across 70 construct validation studies. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 315–318. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151642
- Credé, M., Harms, P., Niehorster, S., & Gaye-Valentine, A. (2012). An evaluation of the consequences of using short measures of the big five personality traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 874–888. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027403
- Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. (1965). Psychological tests and personnel decisions. In L. J. Cronbach & G. C. Gleser (Eds.), Psychological tests and personnel decisions (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? Journal of Applied Psychology, 102(3), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93(5), 880–896. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.880
- Eid, M., Nussbeck, F. W., Geiser, C., Cole, D. A., Gollwitzer, M., & Lischetzke, T. (2008). Structural equation modeling of multitrait-multimethod data: Different models for different types of methods. *Psychological Methods*, 13(3), 230–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013219
- Ewen, C., Wihler, A., Blickle, G., Oerder, K., Ellen, B. P., Douglas, C., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Further specification of the leader political skill-leadership effectiveness relationships: Transformational and transactional leader behavior as mediators. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(4), 516–533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013. 03.006
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/ BRM.41.4.1149
- Ferris, G. L., Witt, L. A., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2001). Interaction of social skill and general mental ability on job performance and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1075–1082. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010. 86.6.1075
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1974). Attitudes towards objects as predictors of single and multiple behavioral criteria. Psychological Review, 81(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0035872
- Gansen-Ammann, D.-N., Meurs, J. A., Wihler, A., & Blickle, G. (2019). Political skill and manager performance: Exponential and asymptotic relationships due to differing levels of enterprising job demands. Group & Organization Management, 44(4), 718–744. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601117747487
- Grant, A. M. (2013). Rethinking the extraverted sales ideal: The ambivert advantage. Psychological Science, 24(6), 1024–1030. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612463706
- Hilbig, B. E., Zettler, I., Leist, F., & Heydasch, T. (2013). It takes two: Honesty-humility and agreeableness differentially predict active versus reactive cooperation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(5), 598–603. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.008
- Hoffman, B., Lance, C. E., Bynum, B., & Gentry, W. A. (2010). Rater source effects are alive and well after all. Personnel Psychology, 63(1), 119–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01164.x
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 100–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010. 88.1.100
- Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Issues and non-issues in the fidelity-bandwidth trade-off. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17(6), 627–637. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199611)17:6<627::AID-JOB2828>3. 0.CO;2-F
- Hogan, R., & Blickle, G. (2013). Socioanalytic theory. In N. D. Christiansen & R. P. Tett (Eds.), Handbook of personality at work (pp. 53–70). Routledge/Taylor and Francis.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). Hogan personality inventory manual. Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Shelton, D. (1998). A socioanalytic perspective on job performance. Human Performance, 11, 129–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.1998.9668028

- Holland, J. L. (1997). Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments (Vol. 3). Prentice Hall.
- Hough, L. M. (1992). The "big five" personality variables-construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance*, 5(1–2), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.1992.9667929
- Hu, J., Zhang, Z., Jiang, K., & Chen, W. (2019). Getting ahead, getting along, and getting prosocial: Examining extraversion facets, peer reactions, and leadership emergence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(11), 1369–1386. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000413

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2014). Methods of meta-analysis (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The big five revisited. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(6), 869–879. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.6.869
- Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2013). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 875–925. https://doi.org/10.1037/ a0033901
- Kam, C. C. S., & Meyer, J. P. (2015). How careless responding and acquiescence response bias can influence construct dimensionality: The case of job satisfaction. Organizational Research Methods, 18(3), 512–541. https:// doi.org/10.1177/1094428115571894
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. Wiley.
- Kholin, M., Meurs, J. A., Blickle, G., Wihler, A., Ewen, C., & Momm, T. D. (2016). Refining the opennessperformance relationship: Construct specificity, contextualization, social skill, and the combination of trait self- and other-ratings. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(3), 277–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891. 2015.1076430
- König, C. J., Steiner Thommen, L. A., Wittwer, A. M., & Kleinmann, M. (2017). Are observer ratings of applicants' personality also faked? Yes, but less than self-reports. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25(2), 183–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12171
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 329–358. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8
- Lee, Y., Berry, C. M., & Gonzalez-Mulé, E. (2019). The importance of being humble: A meta-analysis and incremental validity analysis of the relationship between honesty-humility and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(12), 1535–1546. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000421
- Luft, J., & Ingham, H. (1955). The Johari window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness. Proceedings of the Western Training Laboratory in Group Development, UCLA, Los Angeles, *5*(1), 4.
- Matsunaga, M. (2008). Item parceling in structural equation modeling: A primer. Communication Methods and Measures, 2(4), 260–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312450802458935
- McAbee, S. T., & Connelly, B. S. (2016). A multi-rater framework for studying personality: The trait-reputationidentity model. *Psychological Review*, 123(5), 569–591. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000035
- Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology (pp. 333–352). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., Dipboye, R. L., Hollenbeck, J. R., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection contexts. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 683–729. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00089.x
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2021). Mplus user's guide. Muthén & Muthén.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Series in Psychology. McGraw-Hill.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557–579. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/a0025679
- Oh, I.-S., Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & de Vries, R. E. (2011). Are dishonest extraverts more harmful than dishonest introverts? The interaction effects of honesty-humility and extraversion in predicting workplace deviance. *Applied Psychology*, 60(3), 496–516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00445.x
- Oh, I.-S., Wang, G., & Mount, M. K. (2011). Validity of observer ratings of the five-factor model of personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 762–773. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021832

- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, machiavellianism, and psychopathy. Journal of Research in Personality, 36(6), 556–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6
- Paunonen, S. V., Rothstein, M. G., & Jackson, D. N. (1999). Narrow reasoning about the use of broad personality measures for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(3), 389–405. https://doi.org/10. 1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199905)20:3<389::AID-JOB917>3.0.CO;2-G
- Penney, L. M., David, E., & Witt, L. A. (2011). A review of personality and performance: Identifying boundaries, contingencies, and future research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 297–310. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.005
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539–569. https://doi.org/10. 1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2005). Kurzversion des big five inventory (BFI-K). *Diagnostica*, 51(4), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924.51.4.195
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the big five inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(1), 203–212. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.001
- Reise, S. P. (2012). The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 47(5), 667–696. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2012.715555
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, 38(2), 555–572. https://doi.org/10.2307/256693
- Rodriguez, A., Reise, S. P., & Haviland, M. G. (2016). Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting statistical indices. *Psychological Methods*, 21(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000045
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.30
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(2), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.87.2.245
- Tett, R. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2007). Personality tests at the crossroads: A response to Morgeson, Campion, Dipboye, Hollenbeck, Murphy, and Schmitt (2007). *Personnel Psychology*, 60(4), 967–993. https://doi.org/10. 1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00098.x
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. G. (2006). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(4), 703–742. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991. tb00696.x
- Thoits, P. A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital status comparisons. Social Psychology Quarterly, 55(3), 236–256. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786794
- Treadway, D. C. (2012). Political will in organizations. In G. R. Ferris & D. C. Treadway (Eds.), Politics in organizations: Theory and research considerations (pp. 529–554). Routledge/Taylor and Francis.
- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 525–531. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81. 5.525
- Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person? The self-other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98(2), 281–300. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017908
- Vergauwe, J., Hofmans, J., & Wille, B. (2022). The leadership arena-reputation-identity (LARI) model: Distinguishing shared and unique perspectives in multisource leadership ratings. Advance online publication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001012
- Vinchur, A. J., Schippmann, J. S., Switzer, F. S. I., & Roth, P. L. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 586–597. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.586
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 108–131. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.108

- 37
- Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. Academy of Management Journal, 41(5), 540–555. https://doi.org/10.2307/256941
- Wihler, A., Meurs, J. A., Momm, T. D., John, J., & Blickle, G. (2017). Conscientiousness, extraversion, and field sales performance: Combining narrow personality, social skill, emotional stability, and nonlinearity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 291–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.045
- Wheeler, A. R., Shanine, K. K., Leon, M. R., & Whitman, M. V. (2014). Student-recruited samples in organizational research: A review, analysis, and guidelines for future research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.1204
- Wilmot, M. P., Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Ones, D. S. (2019). Extraversion advantages at work: A quantitative review and synthesis of the meta-analytic evidence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(12), 1447–1470. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000415
- Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Honesty-humility and a person-situation interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, 24(7), 569–582. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.757

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of the article at the publisher's website.

How to cite this article: Wihler, A., Blickle, G., Ewen, C., Genau, H., Fritze, S., Völkl, L., Merkl, R., Missfeld, T., & Mützel, M. (2022). An integrative approach to more nuanced estimates of personality–job–performance relations. *Applied Psychology*, 1–37. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12391</u>